



\$~16

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

+ **W.P.(C) 7570/2022 and CM APPL. 23245/2022**

LALIT KALA AKADEMI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. V. Shashank Kumar and Mr. V.
S. R. Krishna, Advocates.

versus

MRS VISHALAKSHI NIGAM

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Umesh Chandra Sharma,
Mr. Peeyush Kaushik, Mr. M.K Gaur,
Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% **15.04.2026**

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

“a) Issue the writ of Certiorari or any other appropriate writ or order to declare illegal and set aside the impugned order dated 25.04.2022 in case no. Second Appeal Nos. CIC/LKALA/A/2020/6776418-UM passed by the Central Information Commission, New Delhi.

b) Any other relief which this Hon'ble Court deem fit and proper under the circumstances of the case may also be awarded in favour of the Petitioner and against the respondent herein in the interest of justice.”

2. The facts of the case would indicate that the private-respondent on 29.12.2019 had preferred an application under the provisions of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”), seeking *inter alia*, information, file notings, and orders pertaining to her suspension. Ultimately, the matter



travelled to the Central Information Commission ('CIC'), which passed the order dated 25.04.2022 ("**Impugned Order**"). The material portion of which reads as under:

"7. ...Moreover, after the inspection on the same day the Commission will decide at 11.30 am as to why a penalty of Rs. 25000/- should not be imposed on Mr. Vikram Mehra, DS (A&A) and why should disciplinary action not be recommended against him for not complying with the order of CIC.

8. The Commission also directs the registry to also send a copy of this order to the Secretary, Ministry of Culture and Chairman, LKA, so that higher authorities of the Department should know as to how the department is making a mockery of RTI Law and take corrective action against erring officials accordingly."

3. It appears that after the suspension of the respondent, she was terminated from her services, however, the termination was set aside by Central Administrative Tribunal, New Delhi ('CAT') and the said respondent had been reinstated.

4. The Court is of the opinion that the underlying grievance pertaining to the non-furnishing of information etc., at this point in time, in the instant writ petition would only be an academic exercise. The CIC has under the Impugned Order, asked the officer concerned (who as on date has retired) to show cause as to why penalty be not imposed upon him, and why departmental inquiry be not initiated against him. The departmental inquiry of the retired officer, at this point of time may not be appropriate to be directed. The matter for all practical purposes will have to be closed.

5. Mr. Umesh Chandra Sharma, learned counsel for the private respondent, however, submits that there were certain observations and directions passed by the concerned Ministry regarding lodging of the complaint, which have not been complied with.



6. The said aspect is left open to be adjudicated by the concerned authority. The respondent shall be at liberty to pursue appropriate remedies in accordance with law.

7. In view of the aforesaid, the Impugned Order stands set aside and the petition stands disposed of along with the pending application.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

APRIL 15, 2026

Nc