



\$~90

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 4842/2026**

SUDHANSHU SIKKA

.....Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.
versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Akash Chatterjee, Senior Panel
Counsel for R-1.
Ms. Mrinalini Sen, SC with Mr.
Pranay Lakhanpal, Advocates for R-
2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% **13.04.2026**

CM APPL. 23716/2026 (for exemption)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 4842/2026

1. The instant petition is for the following reliefs:-

“a. That this Hon’ble Court by a Writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ, direction or order to direct the Respondent no. 1 & 2 to provide the information with respect to point no. 5 & 6 of the RTI Application dated 06.09.2019 filed by the Petitioner;

b. That this Hon’ble Court by a Writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ, direction or order to direct the Respondent no. 1 & 2 to file a detailed affidavit with regard to the said Office Memorandum dated 15.11.2018 and the how many individuals have been given the benefit of the same and what is the eligibility criteria to avail the benefit of the Office Memorandum dated 15.11.2018;



c. Direct the Respondent no. 1 to ensure, that the Office Memorandum dated 15.11.2018 should not be misused by the Respondent no. 2, as the same was issued on the pretext of giving benefit to general public, but the Respondent no. 2 is misusing the same and giving benefit by pick and choose;

d. cost of the Petition be provided for; and such further and other reliefs as this Hon'ble Court may deem just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case."

2. A perusal of the record would indicate that the petitioner on 06.09.2019 filed an RTI application bearing No. DDATY/R/2019/51380 seeking disclosure of information regarding the implementation of the Office of Memorandum dated 15.11.2018. In the present proceedings, this Court is concerned only with query nos. (V) and (VI), the remaining queries have already been responded at various stages. The said queries read as under

" V. Kindly provide the list of Registrants/applicants of Rohini Residential Scheme, 1981 who have been given relaxation by the Delhi Development Authority in lieu of the Office Memorandum dated 15.11.2018 issued by Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs till 05.09.2019.

VI. How is the eligibility criteria defined for giving the relaxation under the said Office Memorandum dated 15.11.2018? "

3. The petitioner submits that the RTI in question was forwarded to the concerned CPIO i.e. Asst Director(LSB), Rohini, DDA and given a new registration No. DDATY/R/2019/51380/1. It is submitted that the petitioner thereafter approached the Central Information Commission ('CIC'), which vide order dt.30.06.2021 directed respondent no.2/Public Information Officer ('PIO') to provide certain information with respect to points III, IV, V and VI within 30 days.

4. The aforementioned order was partly complied with, wherein queries



(V) and (VI) remained unanswered in the communication by the DDA *vide* letter dt. 02.07.2021.

5. Thereafter, respondent no.2 furnished a reply dated 15.07.2021, stating that information sought *qua* query (V) is not readily available in the compiled form and that query (VI) does not fall within the purview of RTI Act, 2005. The petitioner submits that in view of the unresolved queries, a non-compliance application before the CIC was filed on 27.07.2021, wherein the CIC *vide* order dated 01.06.2022 directed respondent no.2 to provide a reply on queries (V) and (VI) within 30 days.

6. The petitioner then filed a representation for continued non-compliance on 29.08.2022. It is the petitioner's grievance that the aforementioned order of the CIC dt 01.06.2022 have not been complied with.

7. The facts however would indicate that after 29.08.2022, the petitioner had not taken any concrete steps for seeking compliance of the directions passed by the CIC. For the said reason, this Court is not inclined to issue any direction in the instant petition.

8. If there is any other grievance, the petitioner shall be at liberty to file a fresh application before the PIO. Even otherwise there is no bar in applying afresh for the desired information.

9. With the aforesaid observations and liberty, the instant petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

APRIL 13, 2026

Nc