



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 198 OF 2026

Jaypal Govardhan Rathod

...Petitioner

Versus

The State Information Commissioner & Ors. ...Respondents

- Mr. Krushna Solanke h/f Mr. Naik Sarvesh Jaipal, Advocate for the Petitioner.
- Mr. R. S. Wani, AGP for Respondent – State.

**CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI AND
RAJNISH R. VYAS, JJ.**

DATE : FEBRUARY 16, 2026

P. C. :

1. The present petition has been filed for directing the respondent authorities to provide the payment slips and other demanded documents from him.

2. The petitioner had filed an application on 18th January 2019 seeking information from respondent No.3 in respect of a proposal forwarded by office of Shri. Sevadas Shikshan Prasarak Mandal, Nanded, for approval of Shri. Gotamwad on the post of Junior Clerk. The petitioner states that respondent No.3 replied that the information sought by the petitioner was not available with its office. A first appeal was preferred by the petitioner before respondent No.2,

who decided the said appeal on 11th April 2019. Respondent No.2 had directed respondent No.3 to supply the information as sought by the petitioner. As this direction was also not complied with, the petitioner preferred a second appeal before the State Information Commission. The State Information Commission by order dated 10th July 2019 then directed respondent No.3 to supply the information to the petitioner within a period of 30 days. Thereafter also there was no compliance. The petitioner had approached before this Court by filing Writ Petition No. 1701 of 2020, which came to be decided on 06th March 2023, thereby directing the petitioner to approach under the Right to Information Act. Thereafter, the petitioner again filed an application to the Public Information Officer on 13th May 2025 for supply of the information; however, it has not been supplied. Hence the petition.

3. Heard learned advocate for the petitioner. The fact still remain is that when the State Commission has also passed an order and the Right to Information Act prescribes for penalty under Section 20, then the petitioner should go for execution of the said order. There cannot be then the order against even the respondent No.2 to supply the said information. There is absolutely no reason given in the petition as to why the petitioner has not approached the appropriate

authority under Section 20 of the Right to Information Act. Upon the query, the learned advocate for the petitioner now seeks withdrawal of the petition with liberty to approach the concerned authority for implementation of the order.

4. In view of the said statement, we dispose of the writ petition with liberty as prayed.

(RAJNISH R. VYAS, J.)

(SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI, J.)