

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 3993 OF 2022

Arohi Solutions
Through Its Proprietor
Anil Vijay Kumar Katwate

PETITIONER

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra and Others RESPONDENTS

.....

Mr. Mrigesh Narwadkar, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. S.W. Munde, AGP for respondent - State

.....

[CORAM : NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.]

DATE : 31st MARCH, 2022

ORDER :

1. The petitioner is aggrieved by the order of respondent No. 4 who has directed the respondent No. 6 to give the information in respect of the petitioner, which according to the petitioner is his personal information, which is not liable to be furnished under the Right to Information Act. The petitioner contends that no notice of hearing and/or opportunity of hearing was given to the petitioner while passing the impugned order. The petitioner has raised objection which

was addressed to respondent No. 2 on 10.03.2022, the same is also not considered. Further contention is the impugned order is therefore contrary to the provisions of Section 11 of the Right To Information Act.

2. In support of his aforesaid submission, learned advocate for the petitioner placed reliance on Skill Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd and Anr. Vs. State Information Commissioner and Ors. (Writ Petition No. 9922/2009).

3. The learned Assistant Government Pleader on the other hand submits that the petitioner has alternate efficacious remedy of filing appeal.

4. Taking into consideration the fact that prima facie it appears that the opportunity of hearing is not given to the petitioner while passing the impugned order, the impugned order is stayed for a period of two weeks from today.

5. In the meanwhile, the petitioner shall file statutory appeal and seek stay to the impugned order.

6. The writ petition is disposed of in above terms. All the contentions of the petitioner are kept open.

[NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI]
JUDGE