



\$~40

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4515/2023**

RAVINDER SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms Aanchal, Adv. with petitioner in person.

versus

**CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
& ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Ms Avni Singh(Panel Counsel-GNCTD) with Mr Vaibhav Sharma, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

09.02.2026

1. The grievance raised by the petitioner is with respect to the impugned communication dated 01.12.2022, whereby, his appeal was refused to be considered ostensibly on the ground that earlier the same was decided by the Central Information Commission ['CIC'].
2. The petitioner submits that what was decided earlier was the complaint dated 17.11.2022 and the petitioner's appeals, which were filed under Section 19(3) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 ['RTI Act'] have not been dealt with on merit. The communication dated 01.12.2022 is extracted as under:

"Reference your Second Appeal/Complaint dated 17-11-2022 received on 17-11-2022 vide above Diary Number.



On Scrutiny of the above Appeal/Complaint it is found that, Appeal/Complaint relating to the same RTI has been registered earlier and decided vide file no. CIC/GNCTD/C/2022/104919. As there is no provision of review in Commission, your Appeal/Complaint cannot be registered.

Whereas you can still file an application for non-compliance, in regard to aforesaid Second Appeal/Complaint which has been already decided.”

3. If the decision dated 11.10.2022 is considered, the same seems to have been passed in complaint no. CIC/GNCTD/C/2022/104913-UM and other matters, and whereby the complaints filed by the petitioner were disposed of. There does not seem to be any adjudication on appeals preferred by the petitioners by the CIC on their merits.
4. If the petitioner has preferred a statutory appeal under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, the same should be taken to its logical conclusion and should not be understood to have been disposed of on the basis of some complaint which the petitioner, otherwise, had made.
5. Having considered the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the Court deems it appropriate to direct the CIC to allow the petitioner to re-file the appeals, and if such appeals are presented, let they be decided on their own merit, expeditiously.
6. Petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

FEBRUARY 9, 2026/P