

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19586 of 2021

=====

Vikash Chandra @ Guddu Baba S/o Late Ramashray Prasad R/o House No.39, Road No.-12, Indrapuri, P.O.- Keshari Nagar, P.S.- Pataliputra, Dist-Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, Department of Cabinet Secretariat and Co-ordination Department, Govt of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Deputy Secretary to the Govt. Department of Cabinet Secretariat and Co-ordination Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
5. The Secretary, Department of Energy, Govt of Bihar, Patna.
6. The Deputy Secretary, Department of Energy, Govt of Bihar, Patna.
7. The Advisor cum Public Information Officer, Department of Energy, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Surendra Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Gyan Prakash Ojha (GA-7)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR)

Date : 14-12-2022

Heard Mr. Surendra Kumar Singh, the learned Advocate for the petitioner and Mr. Gyan Prakash Ojha for the State.

The petitioner, a social worker and an RTI activist, felt aggrieved by the communication made to



him by Public Relations Officer of the Energy Department dated 28.10.2021 seeking necessary personal details from him on affidavit before providing him the information sought by him.

The petitioner contended that he was not required to be subjected to such scrutiny before supplying the information so wanted by him.

The counter affidavit on behalf of respondent nos. 3 and 7 is on record, which indicates that such communication was forged and fabricated and that it was never issued by the Department.

Mr. Ojha, learned counsel for the State, however, has submitted that, in the meantime, the information sought by the writ petitioner has been supplied to him.

Mr. Singh, learned Advocate for the petitioner, however, submits that merely saying that the communication made to him by the Public Relations Officer was forged and fabricated would not serve the



purpose. There is no sequel action of the Department or of the State to contain such action in future by any person i.e., trying to prevent the petitioner from seeking necessary information to which he is entitled under law. To that extent, the petitioner may be justified but the present is not the forum for agitating this cause.

However, we do direct the respondents to take care that their good offices are not used by fake persons with a twisted agenda to prevent any dissemination of information regarding institutions/persons.

With the aforementioned observation, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

HR/Sonali/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	.12.2022
Transmission Date	NA

