PALLAVI MAHENDRA WARGAONKAR
Digitally signed by PALLAVI MAHENDRA WARGAONKAR
Date: 2025.12.24 17:47:02 +0530

Pallavi

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 9650 OF 2025
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 11269 OF 2015

Shri. Rejendra Shankarrao Zunjarrao ...Applicant
Versus
State Information Commissioner
Through Its Desk Officer,
State Info. Dept., Pune Bench And Ors. ...Respondents

Mr. Rakesh P. Saroj, for Applicant.

Mrs. M.P. Thakur, AGP, for Respondent Nos.1, 3 and 4 - State.

CORAM : Advait M. Sethna, J.

DATED : 23 December 2025

P.C.:-

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties. An order was passed in these proceedings on 22 December 2025.

2. Pursuant to the said order, the Registry has verified that the matter shall lie before the learned Single Judge of this Court. Accordingly, I take up the matter for consideration.

3. Mr. Saroj, learned counsel for the Petitioner has drawn attention of this Court to the order dated 7 February 2024 passed in these proceedings which reads thus:-

> *"1. This petition has been notified as per the list of matters as received from the Office of learned Government Pleader to have become infructuous. As per office notice dated 25 January 2024, Advocate for the petitioner/s was called upon to give a praecipe in advance in case the petition*

has not become infructuous. Such praecipe has not been received in regard to this petition.

2. *Accordingly, the petition is disposed of as infructuous; however, with liberty to the petitioner to revive the petition in case something survives.*

3. *The writ petition is disposed of in above terms. No costs.*

4. *Pending interlocutory application/s, if any, does not survive and stands disposed of."*

4. He would submit that the Petition though disposed of as infructuous is not so. In light of such statement, the Petition is restored to the file of this Court. Mrs. Thakur does not fairly object to this.

5. However, the attention of the Court is drawn to an order dated 3 October 2015 passed by the State Information Commission, Respondent No.2 Pursuant to such order, the Petitioner was directed to make payment of Rs.5,000/-. The Petitioner has duly complied with the said order by making payment of Rs.5,000/- which is recorded in the subsequent order of the second Respondent dated 12 October 2015. The Petitioner has also furnished a challan for the said payment which is taken on record and marked **'X'** for identification.

6. It appears that in light of the above developments and the payments made in terms of the order impugned in these proceedings, nothing would survive in the Petition.

7. The Petition is accordingly disposed of as withdrawn. Interim Application, if any, also do not survive and the same are disposed of.

(Advait M. Sethna, J)