



\$~76

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

+ CONT.CAS(C) 441/2026

CA RAKESH KUMAR GUPTAPetitioner

Through: Petitioner in person (through v/c)

versus

SMT. ANANDI RAMALINGAM & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Vijay Joshi, CGSC (through v/c)
and Mr. Kuldeep Singh, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

% **08.04.2026**

CM APPL.22323/2026 (for recalling / correction in order dated 18.03.2026)

1. The present application seeks recall of order dated 18.03.2026.
2. The applicant/petitioner raises an exception to the observations made in paragraphs 2 and 4 of the order dated 18.03.2026. The said paragraphs read as under:

“2. During the course of hearing, the petitioner has confined its grievance to the alleged illegality in the order dated 17.02.2025 passed by the Central Information Commission in Second Appeal No. CIC/CICOM/A/2024/623184.

4. It is also noted that the petitioner has sought to implead the Counsel for the respondents/Central Information Commission (CIC) in the present petition; the same is improper and thoroughly misconceived.”

3. As regards the observations of this Court recorded in paragraph 4 of the order dated 18.03.2026, the petitioner submits that the purport of the petitioner is not to implead the counsel for the respondent in the present proceedings. The name of counsel has been simply referred to in the memo of parties.
4. As regards the observation in paragraph 2, the petitioner submits that the grievance of the petitioner is not merely confined to the illegality in



order dated 17.02.2025 passed by the Central Information Commission (CIC) in Second Appeal No.CIC/CICOM/A/2024/623184, but the grievance is in respect of the practices generally being followed by the CIC which have been set out in the present application.

5. Having considered the aforesaid submissions, this Court finds that the present application is misconceived inasmuch as the order dated 18.03.2026 was passed, based on the proceedings as they actually transpired on 18.03.2026.

6. Be that as it may, this Court has considered the contents of the application wherein the petitioner has articulated various concerns regarding the procedures and practices being followed by the CIC. The grievance of the petitioner with regard thereto cannot be adjudicated in exercise of contempt jurisdiction. It is open to the petitioner to avail legal remedies if he is aggrieved by the practices / procedures in vogue in the CIC.

7. As regards the contention of the petitioner that he does not seek to make any allegations against the counsel for CIC, the same is taken on record. No further order is required to be passed as regards thereto.

8. In the circumstances, the present application is dismissed.

9. Needless to say, the petitioner is at liberty to avail appropriate legal remedies to ventilate his grievances in accordance with law.

APRIL 8, 2026/cl

SACHIN DATTA, J