



\$~6

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

+ W.P.(C) 1955/2025

ALKA DHINGRA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anuroop PS and Mr. Sachin
Wadhwa, Advs. (through v/c)

versus

UNION OF INDIA THROUGH SECRETARY & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Abdhesh Chaudhary, CGSC and
Ms. Geetanjali Setia, Adv. for R-
1/UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

% **05.05.2025**

1. The limited relief sought by the petitioner in the present petition is that the appeal filed by the petitioner before the Central Information Commission (hereinafter referred to as '*the CIC*') be heard and decided expeditiously. It is submitted that the said appeal was filed against diary no. 122/89 on 11.07.2024, and was duly registered in the office of the respondent no. 2 on 12.07.2024. It is further submitted that there is no inkling as to the date on which the said appeal shall be taken up for consideration by the CIC.

2. The backdrop of the present petition concerns an application dated 27.01.2024 filed by the petitioner under Section 6 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as the '*RTI Act*'). It is submitted by the petitioner that while a reply to this application was furnished by the concerned Public Information Officer on 19.03.2024, the same was incomplete and misleading.

3. Accordingly, the petitioner had preferred an appeal before the First



Appellate Authority (hereinafter referred to as ‘the FAA’) by filing an application dated 02.04.2024 under Section 19 of the RTI Act.

4. Subsequently, the FAA vide order dated 30.05.2024 had directed the concerned Public Information Officer to provide a revised pointwise information within a period of 15 days. The relevant portion of the said order dated 30.05.2024 is reproduced as under:

“The Appeal was heard on the scheduled date & time. During the hearing, the PIO reiterated the information provided to the Appellant. But the Appellant/ Advocate of the Appellant told that they have neither received satisfactory information from PIO/Building(HQ) nor received the copies of letters by which RTI application has been transferred to other departments to provide information pertaining to them. The Advocate for the Appellant also insisted for providing copies of the sanctioned building plans relating to the property mentioned in the RTI Application. After hearing both the parties, the PIO/EE (B) is directed to provide the revised pointwise information to the Appellant, permissible under the provisions of the RTI Act, 2005, within a period of 15 days.”

5. It is further averred by the petitioner that pursuant to this, since no information was received from the concerned Public Information Officer, the petitioner had preferred the second appeal before the CIC by filing an application dated 11.07.2024 under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act. However, it is the case of the petitioner that the matter is still pending before the CIC and no hearing being scheduled therein.

6. In the aforementioned circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a request to the CIC to list the aforesaid appeal filed by the petitioner for due consideration. Let an endeavor be made to dispose of the same as expeditiously as possible.

7. The petition is disposed of in above terms.

MAY 5, 2025/cl

SACHIN DATTA, J