



\$~64

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4572/2025**

RAJPAL SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aript Bhargava, Adv.

versus

DELHI JAL BOARD THROUGH CPIO

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Sangeeta Bharti, SC, Mr. Shreesh Pathak, Adv. for DJB.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

09.04.2025

%

1. The present petition raises a grievance as regards to the non-compliance of the order dated 29.11.2022 passed by CIC and subsequent denial of requisite information by the respondent/ Chief Public Information Officer (CPIO), Delhi Jal Board,
2. The present petition has been filed in backdrop of an RTI application dated 22.09.2021.
3. It is averred in the petition that since the Public Information Officer of respondent failed to respond to the aforesaid information sought by the petitioner, first appeal was filed by the petitioner on 24.12.2021 before the First Appellate Authority (FAA). However, the FAA also failed to respond and as a consequence thereof, the petitioner was constrained to file a second appeal on 11.05.2022 before the Central Information Commission.
4. *Vide* impugned order dated 29.11.2022, the CIC directed the concerned CPIO to furnish complete point wise information to the petitioner. The said order reads as under:

“Keeping in view the facts of the case and the submissions made by both the parties the Commission finds weight in the deposition of the Appellant and observes that there is an attempt on the part of the



Respondent to hide the information from the Appellant. The Commission further observes that the basic objective of the Right to Information Act is to empower the citizens, promote transparency and accountability in the working of the Public Authorities, eradicate corruption, and to make our democracy work for the people in real sense. But in the present case the CPIO has not furnished any information. Therefore, the Commission taking a serious view of the conduct of the CPIO for not furnishing any information and directs him to submit a written statement before the Commission, explaining the reason, both by post and by uploading to <http://dsscic.nic.in/online-link-paper-compliance/add>. The above directions shall be complied with within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of this order under intimation to the Commission.

Further the Commission directs the CPIO to collect the information from the concerned authority and furnish a complete, point wise information to the Appellant, strictly in accordance with the spirit of transparency and accountability as enshrined in the RTI Act, 2005 within a period of 21 days from the receipt of this order under the intimation to the Commission.

The Appeal stands disposed accordingly.”

5. It is submitted by the learned counsel on behalf of the petitioner that despite passing of the aforesaid direction/s, the CPIO has failed to furnish the requisite information sought by the petitioner.
6. A perusal of the queries raised by the RTI applicant reveals that the same are in nature of an expression of opinion or a critique on the part of the RTI applicant, rather than any request for information.
7. Nevertheless, since it is brought out that the petitioner has already approached the CIC vide an application/ representation dated 17.02.2025, the present matter is disposed of with a direction to the CIC to consider the same and pass appropriate orders.
8. The petition is disposed of in the above terms.

SACHIN DATTA, J

APRIL 9, 2025/cl