

\$~7

***IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

%

Judgment delivered on: 05.07.2021

+ W.P(C) 2317/2021 & CM APPL.6725/2021

UTTAM CHAND MEENA

..... Petitioner

versus

NATIONAL MEDICAL COMMISSION

.....Respondent

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner: Mr. Prashant Vaxish and Mr. Rishabh Sharma,
Advocates.

For the Respondent: Mr. T.Singhdev and Mr. Varun Verma, Advocates
for R-1.

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

1. The hearing was conducted through video conferencing.
2. Petitioner impugns order dated 11.01.2021 passed by the Central Information Commission whereby the Commission has held that the requisite information has already been provided to the petitioner.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the information

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By: HUNAL
MAGGU
Signing Date: 07.07.2021 22:06:57
This file is digitally signed by PS
to HMJ Sanjeev Sachdeva.

W.P(C) 2317/2021

Digitally Signed
By: JUSTICE SANJEEV
SACHDEVA
Signing Date: 07.07.2021
21:45

provided does not still satisfy the petitioner in as much as the Gazette notification does not show the name of the institute from which the concerned doctor has obtained her qualifications.

4. Petitioner had by the subject application sought an information as to whether Moscow Medical Institute named after N.A. Semoshko, Moscow (USSR) is approved by the MCI or not.

5. The MCI has given a response to the application that as per Part-II of Third Schedule of the IMC Act, the name of Moscow Medical Institute (old name) and The Sechenov First Moscow Medical Institute, USSR (new name) is included in the said Schedule.

6. The contention of the petitioner is that the subject institute is not the Moscow Medical Institute named after N.A. Semashko, Moscow (USSR).

7. Learned counsel has sought to contend that the “*Moscow Medical Institute (old name) and The Sechenov First Moscow Medical Institute, USSR (new name)*” is not the “*Moscow Medical Institute named after N.A.Semashko*”. He submits that the two institutes are different.

8. The specific query was whether Moscow Medical Institute named after N.A. Semashko, Moscow is included in the schedule or not, to which the response is that Moscow Medical Institute (old

name) and The Sechenov First Moscow Medical Institute is included in the said Schedule. A copy of the entire third schedule including the names of all the recognised medical qualifications granted by Medical Institutes has been annexed by the Petitioner as Annexure P – 10. Annexure P – 10 is a copy that appears to have been downloaded from the website of the Medical Council of India.

9. The contention of the petitioner that “*Moscow Medical Institute (old name) and The Sechenov First Moscow Medical Institute, USSR (new name)*” is not the “*Moscow Medical Institute named after N.A.Semashko* and that the Institute named after N.A. Semashko is *Moscow Medical Stomatological Institute, Moscow* and that the certificate of the concerned doctor does not give the complete name of the Institute cannot be subject matter of a query under the Right to Information Act.

10. Respondent has duly answered the query raised and provided the information. The information is also otherwise available in public domain and petitioner has accessed the same and even annexed a copy of the entire schedule as available on the website of the Medical Council of India in this petition.

11. In case petitioner has a grievance about the name of the Institute or the education qualifications of the concerned doctor, petitioner would have to raise an appropriate grievance before the

appropriate forum in accordance with law.

12. This Court in an application under Right to Information Act would not go into the merits of the information. This Court is only to examine whether the query has been duly responded to or not.

13. As noticed above, the query has been duly responded to by the concerned authority and the information sought is also otherwise available in public domain and petitioner has accessed the same and even annexed a copy thereof with this petition.

14. There is no infirmity in the impugned order of the Central Information Commission. The Petition is accordingly dismissed. All rights and contentions of the parties are reserved.

15. Copy of the Order be uploaded on the High Court website and be also forwarded to learned counsels through email.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J.

JULY 05, 2021
rk

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By:RUNAL
MAGGU
Signing Date:07.07.2021 22:06:57
This file is digitally signed by PS
to HMJ Sanjeev Sachdeva.

W.P(C) 2317/2021

Digitally Signed
By:JUSTICE SANJEEV
SACHDEVA
Signing Date:07.07.2021
21:45