



\$~61

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ LPA 145/2026, CM APPL. 17546/2026 & CM APPL. 17547/2026
MANOJ KUMAR SINGHAL & ANR.Appellants
Through: Ms. Nupur Sharma, Ms. Anjaney
Maratha & Mr. Virendra Singh,
Advocates.

versus

PUBLIC GRIEVANCES COMMISSION & ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. Harshit Chopra – Standing
Counsel along with Ms. Swati Tiwari
& Mr. Khushal Chand Agarwal,
Advocates for Respondent
No.2/MCD.
Mr. Amresh Bind, Advocate for
Respondent No.3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

% **ORDER**
20.03.2026

1. Heard Ms. Nupur Sharma learned Counsel representing the Appellants and Mr. Harshit Chopra learned Standing Counsel representing Respondent No. 2 / Municipal Corporation of Delhi (“**MCD**”) and Mr. Amresh Bind learned Counsel representing Respondent No. 3 / Mr. Vijay Pal Singh.
2. This Letters Patent Appeal seeks to challenge an order dated 10.02.2026 (“**Impugned Order**”) passed by the learned Single Judge whereby W.P. (C) No. 17036/2025 (“**Writ Petition**”) instituted by the Appellants has been dismissed and the order dated 19.09.2025 passed by the Public Grievances Commission (“**Commission**”), the Appellate Authority — Respondent No. 1 has been upheld.

LPA 145/2026

Page 1 of 4



3. It appears that an application seeking certain information under the Delhi Right to Information Act, 2001 (“**DRTI Act**”) was moved by Respondent No. 3 before the Public Information Officer (“**PIO**”) of the MCD, which was rejected. During the proceedings of the said application, the Appellants appeared to have objected to the said application *vide* letter dated 01.08.2024 which has been enclosed herewith as Annexure P-3 to the Writ Petition stating therein that since the information sought by Respondent No. 3 pertains to a third party in relation to certain work and involves trade secrets, measurement bills and payment made to the Appellants by the MCD for executing the work, information may not be provided in terms of the exemption under Section 8(d), 8(g) and 8(j) of Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”).

4. The PIO of the MCD, however, rejected the application moved by Respondent No. 3. Feeling aggrieved by the said order of rejection of application, Respondent No. 3 preferred an Appeal under Section 7 of the DRTI Act before the Appellate Authority — the Commission. The Commission by its order dated 19.09.2025 allowed the appeal and directed the Competent Authority of the MCD to go through the information sought by Respondent No. 3 and issue a revised reply within fifteen days.

5. It is noteworthy that though the PIO (Competent Authority) of the MCD had provided an opportunity of representing their case to the Appellants who submitted their reply *vide* letter dated 01.08.2024, however, Respondent No. 3 while filing the Appeal before the Commission under Section 7 of the DRTI Act did not implead the Appellants as Party Respondents. The order dated 19.09.2025 passed by the Commission was challenged by the Appellants by instituting the proceedings of the underlined Writ Petition,



which has been dismissed by the learned Single Judge *vide* Impugned Order dated 10.02.2026.

6. The learned Single Judge while dismissing the Appeal has observed that no information sought can be denied only on the ground that the information sought is voluminous, however, the fact that the objections raised by the Appellant before the PIO was not considered either by PIO or by the Commission appears to have lost sight of by the learned Single Judge.

7. We may refer in this regard to reproduce of Section 6(b) of the DRTI Act, which provides that the Competent Authority before whom information is sought, may withhold the information for reasons to be recorded in case information sought relates to an individual or disclosure of which would constitute a clear and unwarranted invasion of personal privacy and has no relationship to any activity of the Government or which will not sub-serve to the public interest.

8. We may note that though the objections raised by the Appellants in their letter dated 01.08.2024 mentions certain provisions of RTI Act, however, merely because a wrong provision was mentioned will not preclude the Competent Authority or a Commission to at least return of finding on the objection raised by the Appellants.

9. In the aforesaid view of the matter, we are of the opinion that since the information sought was in respect of the Appellants, as such the objection raised by the Appellants that the information may not be provided to Respondent No. 3 ought to have been considered and a finding ought to have been returned both by the Competent Authority (PIO) under the DRTI Act and also by the Appellate Authority, namely, the Commission while deciding the Appeal under Section 7 of the DRTI Act, which was filed by Respondent



No. 3 against the order of the Competent Authority refusing the information.

10. For the aforesaid reasons, the Appeal is allowed. The order dated 10.02.2026 passed by the learned Single Judge in the Writ Petition as also the order dated 19.09.2025 passed by the Commission are hereby set aside.

11. The matter is remitted to the Competent Authority of the Delhi Municipal Corporation under the DRTI Act to re-consider the application seeking information submitted by Respondent No. 3 after giving the opportunity of hearing to the Appellants and permitting them to raise their objections, if any.

12. The Competent Authority is directed to expedite the proceedings of the application and conclude the same with expedition, preferably within a period of two months from the date. This Order is brought to his notice. There shall be no order as to cost.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TEJAS KARIA, J

MARCH 20, 2026/ 'A'