



WEB COPY



W.P.No.22800 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 12.08.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN**

W.P.No.22800 of 2024
and
W.M.P.No.24844 of 2024

V.Dharmendiran

.... Petitioner

Vs

1. The Tamil Nadu Information Commission,
Rep. by State Information Commission,
No. 2, Thiyagaraya Salai,
Eldams Road Junction,
Teynampet, Chennai -600 018

2. The First Appellate Authority,
District Revenue Officer,
District Collectorate,
Ranipet District.

3. The Right to Information Officer,
Personal Assistant to Collector(General),
District Collectorate,
Ranipet District.

4. Mr.Anandhan,
Tahsildar Walaja Taluk,
Ranipet District.

.... Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus (i) call for the records pertaining to order dated 02.05.2024 passed by the 1st respondent in Case No. S.A. no. 5166/F/2022 and to quash the same and



W.P.No.22800 of 2024

(ii) consequently to direct the 3rd respondent to provide exact information sought by the Petitioner by the Way of RTI petition dated 28.12.2021 under section 6(1) of RTI Act 2005 and (iii) to take disciplinary action against the 2nd and 3rd Respondents for misrepresenting that sufficient information has been furnished to the petitioner, while in fact the Petitioners RTI Application was blatantly reject in its entirety without furnishing any information.

For Petitioner	: Mr.Logeshwaran
For R1	: Mr.C.Vigneswaran Standing Counsel
For R2 & R3	: Mr.N.Naveen Kumar Government Advocate

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed challenging the order passed by the first respondent dated 02.05.2024, thereby closed the appeal filed by the petitioner on the ground that the informations sought for by the petitioner were already furnished to the petitioner.

2. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the first respondent and the learned Government Advocate appearing for the second and third respondents.

3. The petitioner is a Journalist. He submitted an



W.P.No.22800 of 2024

application on 17.12.2021 seeking information under Section 6(1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 before the third respondent. The information sought for by the petitioner are as follows :-

“1. The year in which the fourth respondent joined the Tamil Nadu Government service and his appointment order.

2. The information regarding the promotions received by the fourth respondent and the period during which he held each post and the promotion orders.

3. The information regarding the year and the time period during which the fourth respondent, was holding the post of Special Tahsildar, Mines and the order copy of the same.

4. The entire service records of the fourth respondent from the date of joining his service to till date.

5. The information regarding form 3 records filed each year by the fourth respondent.

6. The information regarding property details furnished by the fourth respondent when he joined the government service and the details pertaining to movable / immovable assets purchased by the fourth respondent subsequently with the permission of the government.”

4. Those informations with regard to the fourth respondent



W.P.No.22800 of 2024

and as such, the third respondent called for objections from the fourth respondent. The fourth respondent, under Section 11(2) of the Right to Information Act, raised objections on 31.12.2021, stating that none of the information can be disclosed to the petitioner. On the said objection, the application submitted by the petitioner was rejected. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner filed an appeal before the second respondent. The said appeal was also rejected by an order dated 16.03.2022. Aggrieved by the same, once again the petitioner filed an appeal before the first respondent. While being so, the third respondent, by its communication dated 21.01.2022, represented before the first respondent that sufficient informations have been already furnished to the petitioner. It was recorded and the appeal was closed. Further, it is also seen that the petitioner, being a Journalist, has no right to ask for personal particulars of the fourth respondent and the fourth respondent raised objections. Whatever informations which are permissible under law were already furnished to the petitioner.

5. Therefore, this Court finds no infirmity or illegality in the order passed by the first respondent dated 02.05.2024. Thus, the writ petition is devoid of merits and is liable to be dismissed. Accordingly,



W.P.No.22800 of 2024

this writ petition stands dismissed. Consequently, connected
miscellaneous petition is closed. No costs.

12.08.2024

Internet: Yes
Index : Yes/No
Speaking/Non Speaking order
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
Lpp

To

1. The Tamil Nadu Information Commission,
Rep. by State Information Commission,
No. 2, Thiyagaraya Salai,
Eldams Road Junction,
Teynampet, Chennai -600 018

2. The First Appellate Authority,
District Revenue Officer,
District Collectorate,
Ranipet District.

3. The Right to Information Officer,
Personal Assistant to Collector(General),
District Collectorate,
Ranipet District.

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN. J,

Lpp



WEB COPY



W.P.No.22800 of 2024

W.P.No.22800 of 2024

12.08.2024