

09/04
2026

AD/04/24
266312
NANDY

**In the High Court at Calcutta
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side**

WPA/11212/2019
CAN/2/2024
CAN/1/2022

**RAJIB KUMAR PAL
VS.**

WEST BENGAL INFORMATION COMMISSION & ORS.

Mr. Jayanta Narayan Chatterjee, Advocate
Mr. Supreem Naskar, Advocate
Ms. Jayashree Patra, Advocate
Ms. Pritha Sinha, Advocate
Mr. Suprava Dey, Advocate

.....for the Petitioner

Mr. Amitava Chaudhuri, Advocate
Mr. N. Roy, Advocate

.....for the College

Mr. Raja Saha, Advocate

.....for Respondent Nos. 1 & 2

CAN/2/2024

1. This is an application for condonation of delay in filing CAN 1 of 2022.
2. Having heard the learned Advocate appearing for the petitioner and upon perusal of the materials on record, I am satisfied with the explanation offered for the delay, as sufficient cause existed which prevented the petitioner from filing the application for recall/restoration.
3. Accordingly, the application for condonation of delay being **CAN/2/2024** is **allowed**.

CAN/1/2022

4. Having heard the learned advocates appearing for the respective parties and upon perusal of the materials on record, I am satisfied with the explanation offered for the absence of the learned advocate for the petitioner on 29.09.2022, when the writ petition was dismissed for default.
5. Accordingly, the application being **CAN/1/2022** is **allowed**.
6. The order dated **29.09.2022** is **recalled**.

7. **WPA/11212/2019** is **restored** to its original file and number.

WPA/11212/2019

8. Petitioner's grievance is that he had not been furnished the information, as sought for, to ascertain whether his application for appointment as a 'Clerk' has been duly dealt with.
9. In furtherance thereof, the petitioner had made an application under the Right to Information Act, 2005, before the State Public Information Officer. The matter was heard and disposed of by an appropriate order, which was carried in appeal before the Appellate Authority. The Appellate Authority, after giving adequate opportunity of hearing, passed an order 24.09.2018, which has been assailed in this writ-petition.
10. The respondent no. 4 has filed his affidavit, which is kept on record. The affidavit was served on the petitioner in September 2022, to which no reply has yet been filed.
11. From the tenor of the order impugned of 24.09.2018, it appears that all information as sought for by the petitioner had duly been supplied to him, except for the age and address of the members of the Expert Committee.
12. The said information relates to personal information and disclosures, which have no relation to any public activity or interest and would cause an unwarranted invasion of privacy of members of the Expert Committee.
13. The age and address of the members of the Expert Committee are in no way concerned with the grievance of the petitioner.
14. The said application was rightly rejected under Section 8(i)(j) of the Right to Information Act, 2005.

15. In view of the afore-stated, I find no reason to interfere with the order of the Appellate Authority.
16. The writ-petition is accordingly **dismissed**. No order as to costs.

(Reetobroto Kumar Mitra, J.)