



WEB COPY



W.P. No.9340/2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on	Pronounced on
27.03.2023	03.04.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

**W.P. NO. 9340 OF 2023
AND
W.M.P. NO.9447 OF 2023**

The Public Information Officer/
Administrator General and
Official Trustee of Tamil Nadu
High Court Campus
Chennai 600 104.

.. Petitioner

- Vs -

1. S.Majeed
2. Tamil Nadu Information Commission
Rep. by its Registrar
No.19, Nandanam
Chennai 600 035.

.. Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying
this Court to issue a writ of certiorari calling for the records of the impugned



W.P. No.9340/2023

WEB COPY

order passed by the Tamil Nadu Information Commission/2nd respondent dated 25.1.2023 in Case No.SA 1579/A/2021 and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr. R.R.Jothimanian

For Respondents : Mr. C.Vigneswaran, GA for R-2

ORDER

The order of the 2nd respondent directing the petitioner to provide the details sought for under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (for short 'RTI Act') by the 1st respondent, has resulted in the filing of the present petition.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that the property situated at No.79 and 80, Broadway, Chennai is administered by the petitioner on the orders of this Court dated 2.5.1939 under a Scheme Decree made in C.S. No.314 of 1930 and for carrying out the charities and welfare measures as per the wish of the Testator under the supervision of this Court, the petitioner has to obtain permission of this Court.

3. It is the further case of the petitioner that the 1st respondent made an application dated 5.2.22 under Section 6 (1) of the Right to Information Act,



W.P. No.9340/2023

WEB COPY

2005 seeking to furnish information with regard to the affairs of MKP Maraikayar Trust. It is the case of the petitioner that the information is in no way related to him as he is in no way connected with the Trust estate nor is a beneficiary. The information with regard to the estate is vested with the petitioner under the scheme decree made in the aforesaid civil suit and the application of the respondent is only made with an ulterior motive. It is the further case of the petitioner that the affairs of the Trust under the control of the petitioner are exempted u/s 8 (1) (e) of the RTI Act. It is the further case of the petitioner that the functioning of the petitioner as Administrator of the Trust is in a fiduciary capacity and the petitioner is not under obligation to furnish any information to third parties and, therefore, the information sought for by the 1st respondent is exempted u/s 8 (1) (e).

4. It is the further case of the petitioner that if any of the beneficiaries of the Trust made an application for information from the petitioner, the petitioner would be under obligation to furnish to them and the 1st respondent, being in no way connected with the Trust, the petitioner is under no obligation to furnish the information as the petitioner is exempted u/s 8 (1)



W.P. No.9340/2023

WEB COPY

(e) of the RTI Act. It is the further case of the petitioner that the information sought for by the 1st respondent is totally irrelevant to him and does not meet the criteria or object of the RTI Act.

5. It is the further case of the petitioner that W.P. No.32025/19 filed against the Government has been disposed of vide order dated 2.3.20 and the said writ petition is in no way connected with the present petitioner. However, reply was given by the petitioner vide letter dated 3.3.20 to the 1st respondent that the information sought by the 1st respondent stands exempted u/s 8 (1) (e) of the RTI Act. It is the further case of the petitioner that the appeal before the Registrar General, High Court, viz., the appellate authority u/s 19 (2) of the RTI Act was also rejected vide order dated 1.9.2021. Against the said order, the 1st respondent preferred second appeal in S.A. No.6601/A/2020 before the 2nd respondent, which was dismissed on the ground of non-appearance of the petitioner. Thereafter, another second appeal has been filed by the 1st respondent before the 2nd respondent in S.A. No.1579/2021 in which the 2nd respondent has issued notice of enquiry dated 13.01.2023.



W.P. No.9340/2023

WEB COPY

6. It is the further case of the petitioner that though on the day the petitioner was represented by an authorised officer, however, the 2nd respondent had informed that the property is a public property and, therefore, the petitioner is under obligation to furnish the information to the 1st respondent leading to the passing of the impugned order, whereby direction has been given to provide the information as sought for within a period of 15 days from the date of receipt of a copy of the order. It is the case of the petitioner that the order passed by the 2nd respondent is wholly illegal and reveals total non-application of mind, as the Trust estate of MKP Maraikayar stood vested with the petitioner pursuant to a scheme decree dated 2.5.1939 and, therefore, stood exempted u/s 8 (1) (e). The said provision of law has not been properly appreciated by the 2nd respondent while passing the impugned order.

7. It is the further case of the petitioner that the relationship of the petitioner with the Trust Estate is a fiduciary relationship and the petitioner is under no obligation to furnish the information. It is the further case of the



W.P. No.9340/2023

WEB COPY

petitioner that in a similar case, the 2nd respondent in SA No.3155/A/2019, based on the decision of the Apex Court in ***Central Board of Secondary Education & Anr. – Vs – Aditya Bandopadhyay & Ors. (2011 (8) SCC 497)*** has decided in the opposite manner. However, without considering the same, the 2nd respondent has passed the impugned order. Further, no reasonable opportunity was given to the petitioner to substantiate its claim u/s 8 (1) (e), which is illegal, arbitrary, unjust and in utter violation of principles of natural justice. Therefore, aggrieved by the said order, the present writ petition has been filed.

8. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner vociferously contended that the order passed by the 2nd respondent is wholly arbitrary, perverse, unjust and illegal and is in violation of principles of natural justice as no reasonable opportunity was provided to the petitioner. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that the date on which the case was put up on notice for enquiry, upon the petitioner being represented by an authorised person, the 2nd respondent had expressed its mind and passed the order on



W.P. No.9340/2023

25.1.2023 without affording any opportunity to put for its case. The above act of the 2nd respondent is wholly unsustainable.

9. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that the fiduciary relationship between the petitioner and the Trust Estate has not been properly taken into consideration by the 2nd respondent, wherein the fiduciary is expected to act in good faith and fairness in dealing with the things belonging to the Trust, which view has been affirmed by the Supreme Court in *Aditya Bandopadhyay case* and, therefore, the order of the 2nd respondent is in clear violation of the ratio laid down by the Apex Court.

10. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that similar issue has been decided contrarily by the 2nd respondent in SA No.3155/A/2019 and, therefore, in an identical case, the 2nd respondent cannot give an order contrary to what has already been decided by the 2nd respondent.

11. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that the 2nd respondent ought not to entertain the second appeal for the second time when the second appeal by the 1st respondent had already been dismissed



W.P. No.9340/2023

WEB COPY

and had become final vide order dated 17.2.2022 in SA No.6601/A/2020.

Without the leave of the Commission, the filing of the second appeal for the second time by the 1st respondent is not only bad, but allowing the same is wholly incorrect and, therefore, the said order cannot survive.

12. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that Section 8 (1) (e) of RTI Act bars providing of information held under a fiduciary capacity. In such a backdrop, the finding of the 2nd respondent that the 1st respondent is eligible to get information from the petitioner as sought for u/s 6 (1) of the RTI Act without giving any valid and cogent reasons clearly reveals that the order of the 2nd respondent is a non-speaking order, passed without application of mind.

13. It is the further case of the petitioner that the 1st respondent is a third party and is in no way connected with the affairs of the Trust and that being the case, requesting for information related to the affairs of the Trust, which is held in fiduciary capacity by the petitioner is exempted u/s 8 (1) (e) of the Act. Further, the petitioner is within its right to administer the Trust as per



W.P. No.9340/2023

the provisions of the Scheme Decree and any activity of the Trust is permitted by the orders of this Court and, therefore, the claim of the 1st respondent for certain information, to which Trust he has no nexus, is wholly barred and the information sought for cannot be given. Accordingly, he prays for allowing the present petition.

14. Per contra, learned counsel appearing for the 2nd respondent submitted that the petitioner is a public authority within the meaning of Section 2 (h) of the RTI Act and that the petitioner has no fiduciary relationship with the Trust Estate, but performs the duties as a custodian of the Trust Estate under the Trust Deed and the Scheme Decree which has been approved by this Court in C.S. No.314 of 1930. Further the information sought for by the 1st respondent is squarely covered u/s 2 (j) of the RTI Act and in no way could be said to be exempted u/s 8 (1) (e) of the RTI Act. Therefore, rightly the 2nd respondent had negated the case of the petitioner and directed the petitioner to furnish the information sought for by the 1st respondent, which could in no way be termed to be arbitrary, perverse, unjust and unreasonable.



W.P. No.9340/2023

WEB COPY

15. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that the Supreme Court in *Aditya Bandopadhyay's case* has discussed the meaning, scope and ambit of fiduciary relationship and relationships that would fall within the scope of fiduciary and the present case of the petitioner does not fall within the four corners of the said decision. Further, the said ratio has been reiterated by the Supreme Court in the case of ***Reserve Bank of India – Vs Jayantilal N.Mistry & Ors. (2016 (3) SCC 525*** and, therefore, necessarily the case of the petitioner should fail and the writ petition is liable to be dismissed.

16. This Court gave its careful consideration to the submissions advanced by the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials available on record.

17. The main bone of contention of the petitioner is that there exists a fiduciary relationship between the petitioner and the Trust and, therefore, the petitioner is exempted from providing information u/s 8 (1) (e) of the RTI Act.



W.P. No.9340/2023

WEB COPY

18. Before proceeding to analyse whether fiduciary relationship of the petitioner vis-à-vis the Trust, it is necessary to peruse the relevant provisions of the RTI Act, which have a bearing on this case.

19. “Public Authority” is defined u/s 2 (h), which is as under :-

(h) "public authority" means any authority or body or institution of self- government established or constituted

—

(a) by or under the Constitution;

(b) by any other law made by Parliament;

(c) by any other law made by State Legislature;

(d) by notification issued or order made by the appropriate Government, and includes any—

(i) body owned, controlled or substantially financed;

(ii) non-Government organisation substantially financed,

directly or indirectly by funds provided by the appropriate Government.”

20. There could be no quarrel with the fact that the petitioner is a statutory body and squarely falls within the definition of “public authority” as



W.P. No.9340/2023

WEB COPY

provided u/s 2 (h) of the Act and, therefore, is amenable to the provisions of the RTI Act.

21. In such a backdrop, the Court has to now decide whether there exists a fiduciary relationship between the petitioner and the Trust, which attracts Section 8 (1) (e) of the RTI Act, thereby exempting the petitioner from providing information sought for by the 1st respondent.

22. The Preamble to the Right to Information Act states :-

“An Act to provide for setting out the practical regime of right to information for citizens to secure access to information under the control of public authorities, in order to promote transparency and accountability in the working of every public authority, the constitution of a Central Information Commission and State Information Commissions and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

WHEREAS the Constitution of India has established democratic Republic;

AND WHEREAS democracy requires an informed citizenry and transparency of information which are vital to its functioning and also to contain corruption and to



W.P. No.9340/2023

WEB COPY

hold Governments and their instrumentalities accountable to the governed;

AND WHEREAS revelation of information in actual practice is likely to conflict with other public interests including efficient operations of the Governments, optimum use of limited fiscal resources and the preservation of confidentiality of sensitive information;

AND WHEREAS it is necessary to harmonise these conflicting interest while preserving the paramountcy of the democratic ideal;

NOW, THEREFORE, it is expedient to provide for furnishing certain information to citizens who desire to have it."

23. Section 2 (j) of the Act, specifies the right to information, which is accessible to the citizens, which is under the control of any public authority and includes the right to :-

"2(j) "right to information" means the right to information accessible under this Act which is held by or under the control of any public authority and includes the right to-

(i) inspection of work, documents, records;

(ii) taking notes, extracts, or certified copies of documents or records;

(iii) taking certified samples of material;



W.P. No.9340/2023

WEB COPY

(iv) obtaining information in the form of diskettes, floppies, tapes, video cassettes or in any other electronic mode or through printouts where such information is stored in a computer or in any other device.”

24. Section 6 deals with the request by any person for obtaining information, which shall be made in writing or through electronic means in English or Hindi in the official language of the area in which the application is being made to the competent authority specifying the particulars of information sought by him or her. Sub-section (2) of Section 6 provides that the applicant making request for information shall not be required to give any reason for requesting the information or any other personal details except those that may be necessary for contacting him.

25. Therefore, from sub-section (2) to Section 6, it is implicitly clear that the stand of the petitioner that no reason has been given by the 1st respondent for seeking the said information is beyond the prescription of RTI Act. The prescription in Section 6 (2) is clear that any person can make a request for information and that no reason needs to be given for soliciting the said information except for the personal details of the petitioner. The said



W.P. No.9340/2023

WEB COPY

provision is provided only for the purpose of making the RTI Act more useful, which would arm the citizens while putting some shackles on the public authority, who would be forced to act only in accordance with law. In the aforesaid context, the contention of the petitioner that no reason has been given by the petitioner soliciting the information, even at the very outset, deserves to be negated.

26. As aforesaid, the main ground for the petitioner denying the information sought for by the 1st respondent is on account of the exemption provided for u/s 8 (1) (e) of the RTI Act, which is quoted hereunder :-

“8. Exemption from disclosure of information.-

(1) Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act, there shall be no obligation to give any citizen,--

** * * * **

(e) information available to a person in his fiduciary relationship, unless the competent authority is satisfied that the larger public interest warrants the disclosure of such information.

** * * * **



WEB COPY

27. The petitioner alleges that there exists a fiduciary relationship, which exempts the petitioner from providing the information sought for by the 1st respondent. In this context, it is for this Court to decipher whether such a relationship exists between the petitioner and the Trust, which exempts the petitioner from providing the information under the RTI Act.

28. In *Jayantilal's case (supra)*, the Supreme Court, referring to the ratio laid down in *Aditya Bandopadhyay's case* dealt with the meaning of *fiduciary relationship* and in the said context, the Supreme Court held as under :-

"57. The Advanced Law Lexicon, 3rd Edition, 2005, defines fiduciary relationship as "a relationship in which one person is under a duty to act for the benefit of the other on the matters within the scope of the fiduciary relationship. Fiduciary relationship usually arise in one of the four situations (1) when one person places trust in the faithful integrity of another, who as a result gains superiority or influence over the first, (2) when one person assumes control and responsibility over another, (3) when one person has a duty to act or give advice to another on matters falling within the scope of the relationship, or (4) when there is specific relationship that has traditionally be recognized as involving fiduciary duties, as with a lawyer and a client, or a stockbroker and a customer."



WEB COPY

56. *The scope of the fiduciary relationship consists of the following rules:*

(i) *No Conflict rule-A fiduciary must not place himself in a position where his own interests conflicts with that of his customer or the beneficiary. There must be "real sensible possibility of conflict.*

(ii) *No profit rule-a fiduciary must not profit from his position at the expense of his customer, the beneficiary;*

(iii) *Undivided loyalty rule-a fiduciary owes undivided loyalty to the beneficiary, not to place himself in a position where his duty towards one person conflicts with a duty that he owes to another customer. A consequence of this duty is that a fiduciary must make available to a customer all the information that is relevant to the customer's affairs.*

(iv) *Duty of confidentiality-a fiduciary must only use information obtained in confidence and must not use it for his own advantage, or for the benefit of another person.*

57. *The term fiduciary relationship has been well discussed by this Court in the case of Central Board of Secondary Education and Anr. v. Aditya Bandopadhyay and Ors. (supra). In the said decision, their Lordships referred various authorities to ascertain the meaning of the term fiduciary relationship and observed thus:*



WEB COPY

20.1) *Black's Law Dictionary (7th Edition, Page 640) defines 'fiduciary relationship' thus:*

A relationship in which one person is under a duty to act for the benefit of the other on matters within the scope of the relationship. Fiduciary relationships-such as trustee-beneficiary, guardian-ward, agent-principal, and attorney-client-require the highest duty of care. Fiduciary relationships usually arise in one of four situations: (1) when one person places trust in the faithful integrity of another, who as a result gains superiority or influence over the first, (2) when one person assumes control and responsibility over another, (3) when one person has a duty to act for or give advice to another on matters falling within the scope of the relationship, or (4) when there is a specific relationship that has traditionally been recognized as involving fiduciary duties, as with a lawyer and a client or a stockbroker and a customer.

20.2) *The American Restatements (Trusts and Agency) define 'fiduciary' as one whose intention is to act for the benefit of another as to matters relevant to the relation between them. The Corpus Juris Secundum (Vol. 36A page 381) attempts to define fiduciary thus:*

A general definition of the word which is sufficiently comprehensive to embrace all cases cannot well be given. The term is derived from the civil, or Roman, law. It connotes the idea of trust or confidence, contemplates



WEB COPY

good faith, rather than legal obligation, as the basis of the transaction, refers to the integrity, the fidelity, of the party trusted, rather than his credit or ability, and has been held to apply to all persons who occupy a position of peculiar confidence toward others, and to include those informal relations which exist whenever one party trusts and relies on another, as well as technical fiduciary relations.

The word 'fiduciary,' as a noun, means one who holds a thing in trust for another, a trustee, a person holding the character of a trustee, or a character analogous to that of a trustee, with respect to the trust and confidence involved in it and the scrupulous good faith and candor which it requires; a person having the duty, created by his undertaking, to act primarily for another's benefit in matters connected with such undertaking. Also more specifically, in a statute, a guardian, trustee, executor, administrator, receiver, conservator, or any person acting in any fiduciary capacity for any person, trust, or estate. Some examples of what, in particular connections, the term has been held to include and not to include are set out in the note.

20.3) Words and Phrases, Permanent Edition (Vol. 16A, Page 41) defines 'fiducial relation' thus:

There is a technical distinction between a 'fiducial relation' which is more correctly applicable to legal relationships between parties, such as guardian and ward,



WEB COPY

administrator and heirs, and other similar relationships, and 'confidential relation' which includes the legal relationships, and also every other relationship wherein confidence is rightly reposed and is exercised.

Generally, the term 'fiduciary' applies to any person who occupies a position of peculiar confidence towards another. It refers to integrity and fidelity. It contemplates fair dealing and good faith, rather than legal obligation, as the basis of the transaction. The term includes those informal relations which exist whenever one party trusts and relies upon another, as well as technical fiduciary relations.

20.4) In Bristol and West Building Society v. Mothew [1998 Ch. 1] the term fiduciary was defined thus:

A fiduciary is someone who has undertaken to act for and on behalf of another in a particular matter in circumstances which give rise to a relationship of trust and confidence. The distinguishing obligation of a fiduciary is the obligation of loyalty..... A fiduciary must act in good faith; he must not make a profit out of his trust; he must not place himself in a position where his duty and his interest may conflict; he may not act for his own benefit or the benefit of a third person without the informed consent of his principal.



WEB COPY

20.5) *In Wolf v. Superior Court [2003 (107) California Appeals, 4th 25] the California Court of Appeals defined fiduciary relationship as under:*

any relationship existing between the parties to the transaction where one of the parties is duty bound to act with utmost good faith for the benefit of the other party. Such a relationship ordinarily arises where confidence is reposed by one person in the integrity of another, and in such a relation the party in whom the confidence is reposed, if he voluntarily accepts or assumes to accept the confidence, can take no advantage from his acts relating to the interests of the other party without the latter's knowledge and consent.

21. *The term 'fiduciary' refers to a person having a duty to act for the benefit of another, showing good faith and condour, where such other person reposes trust and special confidence in the person owing or discharging the duty. The term 'fiduciary relationship' is used to describe a situation or transaction where one person (beneficiary) places complete confidence in another person (fiduciary) in regard to his affairs, business or transaction/s. The term also refers to a person who holds a thing in trust for another (beneficiary). The fiduciary is expected to act in confidence and for the benefit and advantage of the beneficiary, and use good faith and fairness in dealing with the beneficiary or the things belonging to the beneficiary.*



W.P. No.9340/2023

WEB COPY

If the beneficiary has entrusted anything to the fiduciary, to hold the thing in trust or to execute certain acts in regard to or with reference to the entrusted thing, the fiduciary has to act in confidence and expected not to disclose the thing or information to any third party. There are also certain relationships where both the parties have to act in a fiduciary capacity treating the other as the beneficiary. Examples of these are: a partner vis-a-vis another partner and an employer vis-a-vis employee. An employee who comes into possession of business or trade secrets or confidential information relating to the employer in the course of his employment, is expected to act as a fiduciary and cannot disclose it to others. Similarly, if on the request of the employer or official superior or the head of a department, an employee furnishes his personal details and information, to be retained in confidence, the employer, the official superior or departmental head is expected to hold such personal information in confidence as a fiduciary, to be made use of or disclosed only if the employee's conduct or acts are found to be prejudicial to the employer.”

29. The Supreme Court, in extensor, had explained as to what are the relationships that would be covered under the fiduciary nature. From the aforesaid decision, it is clear that fiduciary relationship is one in which one



WEB COPY

person is under a duty to act for the benefit of the other on matters relevant to the relationship between them. A fiduciary is someone who has undertaken to act for and on behalf of another in a particular matter in circumstances which give rise to a relationship of trust and confidence. Any relationship existing between the parties to the transaction where one of the parties is duty-bound to act with utmost good faith for the benefit of other party. Showing good faith and candor where such other person reposes trust and special confidence in the person owing or discharging the duty.

30. In the case on hand, the petitioner is a statutory body, which squarely falls under the definition of *public authority*. The acts discharged by the petitioner in respect of each and every Trust Estate under its control is governed by the Trust Deed and the Scheme Decree, which is approved by this Court. But for the Scheme Decree approved by this Court, the petitioner would not have any authority to manage the Trust. Therefore, it is only the Scheme Decree and the approval of the Scheme Decree by this Court, from which the petitioner derives its power to manage the Trust. Therefore, there is no direct relationship of the petitioner with the Testator for doing any



WEB COPY

particular acts based on the confidence and good faith reposed by the Testator on the petitioner. Merely because the petitioner manages the Trust on the basis of the orders of this Court under the Scheme Decree, the petitioner cannot claim that it acts in a fiduciary capacity having relationship with the Testator and, therefore, would be exempted u/s 8 (1) (e) of the RTI Act. To put it in a nutshell, the act of the petitioner is at the behest of the orders of this Court and there is no fiduciary relationship, muchless any relationship between the petitioner and the Testator.

31. The duty of the petitioner is only to perform the charities and welfare measures as per the wishes of the Testator, which has been approved by this Court. There is no direct relationship between the petitioner and the Testator and the petitioner acts only on the basis of the directions of this Court, which is even evident from the averment in the affidavit filed by the petitioner. Such being the case, for each and every act to be performed by the petitioner, the approval of the Court is mandatory, the stand of the petitioner that there is a fiduciary relationship between the petitioner and the Trust Estate is wholly misconceived.



W.P. No.9340/2023

WEB COPY

32. Further, if this Court is to accept the stand of the petitioner that there exists a fiduciary relationship between the petitioner and all the Trust Estates, which are pursuant to Scheme Decrees approved and ordered by this Court, it would be against the character of the petitioner as a public authority as defined u/s 2 (h) of the RTI Act. Such a construction would defeat the very purpose and intent of the RTI Act and would make the provisions of the RTI Act redundant insofar as the petitioner is concerned.

33. Further, a careful perusal of the details sought for by the 1st respondent, shows that the 1st respondent has sought for information with regard to the manner in which the properties of the Trust were sold in auction. The petitioner, being a public authority and the Trust Estate being for carrying out welfare measures, if the citizens file application under the RTI Act to know the manner in which the properties of the Trust Estate are being handled, the said information could not be said to be information, which if disclosed would have a detrimental effect on the activities of the Trust Estate and prejudicial to the Scheme Decree.



W.P. No.9340/2023

WEB COPY

34. The exemption contained in Section 8 (1) (e) applies only to exceptional cases and only with regard to certain pieces of information for which disclosure is unwarranted or undesirable. If information available with the petitioner is not in fiduciary relationship, there is no reason to withhold the disclosure of the same. Having regard to Section 3 of the RTI Act, the citizens have the right to access to all the information held by or under the control of any public authority except those excluded or exempted under the RTI Act. The object of the RTI Act is to empower the citizens to fight against corruption and hold the Government and their instrumentalities accountable to the citizens, by providing them access to information regarding functioning of every public authority. The RTI Act was enacted in order to ensure smoother, greater and more effective access to information recognized under Article 19 of the Constitution. Having regard to the scheme of the RTI Act, the right of the citizens to access any information held by or under the control of any public authority should be read in harmony with the exclusions/exemptions in the RTI Act.



W.P. No.9340/2023

WEB COPY

35. From the above, it is explicitly clear that the wisdom of the Parliament in empowering the citizens should not be curtailed, when law provides for otherwise. In the case on hand, the information sought by the 1st respondent can neither be said to be unwarranted or undesirable information or any confidential information and, therefore, the petitioner, not holding any fiduciary relationship with the Trust Estate, and being a public authority, is bound to give the details as sought for by the 1st respondent. The 2nd respondent has rightly considered the issue and directed furnishing of the information to the 1st respondent by setting aside the orders of the original and first appellate authority. The said act of the 2nd respondent is reasonable, justified and legal and does not suffer the vice of any infirmity warranting interference at the hands of this Court.

36. For the reasons aforesaid, the writ petition fails and the same is dismissed. The petitioner is directed to provide the information as sought for by the 1st respondent within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed. There shall be no order as to costs.



WEB COPY



W.P. No.9340/2023

03.04.2023

Index : Yes / No

GLN



WEB COPY



W.P. No.9340/2023

To

1. The Public Information Officer/
Administrator General and
Official Trustee of Tamil Nadu
High Court Campus
Chennai 600 104.
2. The Registrar
Tamil Nadu Information Commission
No.19, Nandanam
Chennai 600 035.



WEB COPY



W.P. No.9340/2023

M.DHANDAPANI, J.

GLN

**PRE-DELIVERY ORDER IN
W.P. NO.9340 OF 2023**



WEB COPY



W.P. No.9340/2023

**Pronounced on
03.04.2023**