

RMA

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 702 OF 2018

Ajaykumar Indrajeet Singh .. Petitioner
Vs.
The State Information Commissioner &
Ors. .. Respondents

None for Petitioner
Mr. H.J. Dedhia, APP for State

**CORAM : A.S. GADKARI &
MILIND N. JADHAV, JJ.**

DATE : 03rd October, 2022.

P.C.:

- . Heard learned APP.
2. Two Applications dated 27.09.2017 and 15.12.2017 filed by the Petitioner are the subject matter of the present Petition. We propose to deal with them separately as they are in respect of different causes of action.
3. In Application dated 27.09.2017, Petitioner has stated that he had filed RTI Application dated 18.04.2017 before the Public Information Officer / Assistant Commissioner of Police, Sakinaka Division, Powai, Mumbai seeking details of all cases registered under Section 302 IPC (murder cases) and Section 307 (attempt to murder) between 01.01.2010 and 31.12.2011 (period of two years). Petitioner is an accused in Sessions Case No. 589 of 2015.
- 3.1. The Public Information Officer (PIO) rejected the Application of

Petitioner and denied the information sought by him.

3.2. Petitioner being aggrieved filed First Appeal dated 16.05.2017 before the Appellate Authority / DCP, Zone 10, MIDC, Andheri, Mumbai. The Appellate Authority upheld the order of the PIO.

3.3. Being further aggrieved, Petitioner filed Second Appeal dated 23.07.2017 before the State Information Commissioner (SIC). The SIC passed Order rejecting the Appeal on the ground that information sought by Petitioner is third party information.

3.4. Hence Petitioner has filed Application dated 27.09.2017 before us seeking direction to the above authorities to provide the information sought by him on the ground that the authorities have wrongfully denied the information to the Petitioner.

4. We have perused the Application and the Order passed by the SIC. In our opinion, the Competent Authority has come to the right conclusion that, Petitioner being a third party is not concerned with the information which has been sought for by Petitioner and he certainly cannot be provided with the said information.

5. It is seen that the information sought by Petitioner from the Police Station is in the nature of general inquiry and fishing inquiry seeking to furnish details of murder cases and all attempt to murder cases registered under Sections 302 and 307 of IPC and their status in Powai Police Station, Mumbai between 01.01.2010 and 31.12.2011. We agree with the order passed by the SIC and do not find any

infirmity therein.

6. In view of the above, Application dated 27.09.2017 stands disposed of.

7. The Second Application dated 15.12.2017 states that Petitioner had filed Application dated 05.05.2016 seeking details of certified copies of Reports, documents and Applications under Section 7(g) of the RTI Act, 2005, in respect of Sessions Case No. 589 of 2015.

7.1. The Competent Authority rejected the Application of Petitioner due to inadequate details which were not furnished by Petitioner.

7.2. Being aggrieved, Petitioner filed First Appeal No. 02 of 2017 before the Second Additional Principal Judge. The First Appellate Authority dismissed the Appeal on the ground that the information required by Petitioner was not stated correctly as required. Hence Petitioner filed a fresh Appeal stating that he required true certified photocopies of the documents, reports and Applications. He now seeks a direction to the above authorities to provide the certified photocopies to him in the present Application.

8. We have perused the Application dated 15.12.2017 filed by Petitioner. Firstly it is seen that no details, other than the above, have been provided before us. Hence we are at a loss as to decipher the information sought by the Petitioner. The Application is as vague as it can be. The only ground now stated in the Application is the alleged denial of the information by the particular judge as the Sessions Case

No. 589 of 2015 was directed to be transferred from that Court by the Principal Judge. Petitioner has not provided any details whatsoever. Hence we are unable to issue any directions. However, we grant liberty to the Petitioner to provide all specific details as required under the law of the certified copies of documents, reports and applications sought by him. If any such application is made by Petitioner, in accordance with law and as permissible in law, the same shall be dealt with by the Authorities concerned as expeditiously as possible.

9. With the above directions, Application dated 15.12.2017 stands disposed of.

10. In view of the above directions, Writ Petition No. 702 of 2018 stands disposed of.

[MILIND N. JADHAV, J.]

[A.S. GADKARI, J.]

RAVINDRA
MOHAN
AMBERKAR
Digitally signed
by RAVINDRA
MOHAN
AMBERKAR
Date:
2022.11.09
14:54:15
+0530