



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

944 WRIT PETITION NO. 15843 OF 2023

JYOTI COOPERATIVE CREDIT SOCIETY LIMITED THROUGH THE
AUTHORIZED OFFICER BAPU GANGADHAR RANDHAVANE
VERSUS
MAHARASHTRA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION AND OTHERS

...
Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Gandhi Amol S.
AGP for Respondents/State : Mr. P.P. Dawalkar
...

CORAM : SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.
DATE : 17.12.2025

PER COURT :

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the respective parties.
2. By way of the present petition, the petitioner assails the order dated 04.07.2022 passed by the Maharashtra State Information Commission, Bench at Nashik, in Second Appeal No. 927 of 2020.
3. Learned Counsel Mr. Gandhi, for petitioner submits that respondent No. 4 had filed an application under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (for short "The Act") and sought information which is in the nature of personal information and as per Section 11 of the Act such personal information cannot be provided without consent of the person whose information was sought. He further submits that as the petitioner is the Co-Operative Society and respondent No. 4 was not a Member of the Society, the said information could not be provided to him.
4. He further submits that the petitioner being a Co-Operative

Society, the Commission ought not to have passed an order directing the petitioner to provide the information sought. In support of his contention, he relied upon the judgment reported in the case of **Jalgaon Jilla Urban Co-Operative Bank Vs. State of Maharashtra - 2017 (4) Mh.L.J. 301** and invited my attention to paragraph No. 8, 9 and 10 and pointed out that the provisions of the Act are not applicable to the Co-Operative Society.

5. He further relied on the order passed by this Court in the case of **Vikas Sahakari Sakhar Karnhana Ltd., Vs. The State of Maharashtra and Others Writ Petition No. 4752 of 2008** and with other **Writ Petitions decided on 10.04.2015**, wherein, this Court has taken a view that the provisions of the Act are not applicable to the Co-Operative Society. He further relied on the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Thalappalam Ser. Coop. Bank Ltd and Others Vs. Kerala reported in 2013 AIR (SCW) 5683** and submitted that the authority ought not to have directed the petitioner to provide the information.

6. I have gone through the judgments relied upon by the petitioner and the order passed by the State Information Commission. The judgment in the case of **Vikas** (Supra) is overruled by the judgment in the case of **Jalgaon** (supra). The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Thalappalam** (supra) has ruled that information which is in the nature of personal information, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest or which could cause invasion of privacy of the individual cannot be sought by the applicant.

7. The Counsel for the petitioner has argued that respondent No. 4 cannot ask personal information as the same is not permitted under Section 11 of the Act, but the facts at the hand are completely different. Section 11 is not applicable to the present case as respondent No. 4 sought information regarding annual report, list of documents, copies of panchanamas, etc. which are not in the nature of personal information. These documents are public documents and there is no hurdle for the petitioner to provide them.

8. Therefore, I do not find any reason to interfere with the order dated 04.07.2022 passed by the Maharashtra State Information Commission, Bench at Nashik, in Second Appeal No. 927 of 2020 under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

9. In view thereof, the Writ Petition is dismissed. No order as to cost.

(SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.)

mahajansb/