



CWP-11415-2018

1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

(102)

CWP-11415-2018

Date of Decision : 11.09.2025

Dr. Anil Pannikker

...Petitioner

Versus

Central Information Commission,
New Delhi and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Sardavinder Goyal, Advocate and
Mr. Nishant Sindhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurav Verma, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(ORAL)

1. Through the instant writ petition, cast under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, a challenge is thrown to the order dated 19.02.2018 (Annexure P-6), passed by the learned Central Information Commission, wherethrough, the petitioner was denied certain information, vide his application preferred under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act of 2005').

2. Learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3, apprises this Court, that the result of the examination, which was published and uploaded on the official website, was for the limited period only, and since the matter pertains to the year 2016, therefore, after certain period, the same was withdrawn/removed from the official website.

3. He further submits that the second issue, which has been raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner is that he has sought the application under the Act of 2005, before the learned Appellate Authority, Mumbai,



CWP-11415-2018

2

whereas, the Central Information Commission, who has passed the order dated 19.02.2018 (Annexure P-6), is at New Delhi. Therefore, the petitioner ought to have filed the instant petition before the Court of competent jurisdiction, at New Delhi.

4. Finally, he submits that without going into the issue of jurisdiction of this Court, in order to show their *bona fide*, they are still ready and willing to share/supply the final result with the petitioner, which shall be made available to the petitioner, within a period of three weeks from the date of passing of this order.

5. In view of the statement suffered by learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3, learned counsel for the petitioner records satisfaction upon this.

6. Consequently, the instant writ petition is **disposed of**. However, in case, the requisite information i.e. the final result, is not provided to the petitioner, within the stipulated period, the petitioner, would be at liberty to file apt application to get the instant writ petition revived.

7. Since the instant writ petition is disposed of on the basis of concession/undertaking suffered by the learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3, therefore, the issue of jurisdiction is left open, to be adjudicated in an apt motion.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

September 11, 2025
Manpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No