



2024:DHC:3072-DB



\$~47

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **LPA 308/2024 & C.M.No.22104/2024**

SH SUNNY SACHDEVA

..... Appellant

Through: Appellant in person.

versus

ACP NORTH RTI CELL AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through: None

%

Date of Decision: 16th April, 2024

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

JUDGMENT

MANMOHAN, ACJ : (ORAL)

1. Present letters patent appeal has been filed challenging the judgment dated 12th March, 2024 passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court in W.P.(C) No.10436/2022, whereby the writ petition filed by the appellant challenging the order dated 24th February, 2022 passed by Central Information Commission was disposed of in view of the response dated 02nd August, 2023 and on account of initiation of departmental action against personnel who had furnished incorrect information to the appellant.

2. The appellant, who appears in person states that learned Single Judge had failed to appreciate that admittedly the respondents had not only intentionally provided wrong and incorrect information but had also caused inordinate delay in giving the reply. He emphasises that the respondents could have provided correct information when the matter was pending



before the First Appellate Authority and Central Information Commission. He further states that even as of today, the appellant is not satisfied with the response to his queries. He also points out that the respondents have failed to state what action has been taken against the erring officials.

3. A perusal of the impugned order reveals that the amended replies to the queries had been accepted (before the learned Single Judge) by the appellant/petitioner as true and correct and 'to his satisfaction'. However, as the said fact is disputed before this Court, the only option for the appellant is to file an appropriate application before the learned Single Judge in accordance with the judgment of the Supreme Court in *State of Maharashtra Vs. Ramdas Shrinivas Nayak and Another*, (1982) 2 SCC 463.

4. Moreover, as the respondents have already initiated departmental action against the erring officials, it is not open to the appellant at this stage to urge that the respondents have failed to take any action against the erring officials and/or no action has been taken till date. The appellant shall have to wait for the departmental proceedings to conclude before raising such a grievance.

5. Keeping in view the aforesaid, present appeal along with the application is dismissed.

ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

APRIL 16, 2024/KA