



\$~55

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 5973/2025, CM APPL. 27377/2025 and CM APPL. 55507/2025**

CPIO ATMA RAM SANATAN DHARMA COLLEGE

.....Petitioner
Through: Mr Ankur Chhibber, Mr Anshuman Mehrotra, Mr Nikunj Arora, Mr.Arjun Panwar, Mr. Amrit Kaol Mr.Prahil Sharma and Ms. Muskhan Dutt, Advocates.

versus

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION AND ANR

.....Respondent
Through: Mr. Akshay Amritanshu, Senior Panel Counsel with Mr. Mayur Goyal, Mr. Sarthak Srivastava, Advocates for R-1.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER
18.03.2026

%

1. None is present on behalf of respondent no.2.
2. The present petition seeks the quashing the order dated 03.04.2025 passed the Central Information Commission ('CIC'), to the extent that the petitioner-CPIO has been issued a show cause notice for providing, *inter alia*, incorrect reply to the application of the appellant therein; and *qua* certain adverse remarks made against the petitioner and his counsel.
3. It is the case of the petitioner that all documents have been supplied to respondent no.2.



4. The Court *vide* order dated 06.05.2025 also stayed the operation of the impugned order.
5. The Supreme Court in *Neeraj Garg v. Sarita Rani and Ors.*,¹ has held that it is important for Judges and those exercising judicial/quasi-judicial functions to be exercising restraint and avoid unnecessary remarks on the conduct of the counsel which may have no bearing on the adjudication of the dispute before the Court/forum.
6. Accordingly, the adverse remarks contained in the impugned order against the petitioner and his counsel stand expunged. Further, since the grievance of the private respondent stands satisfied the Show Cause Notice issued against the CPIO, and the directions to that effect contained in the impugned order, are set aside.
7. Accordingly, the instant petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J

MARCH 18, 2026

Nc

¹ (2021) 9 SCC 92.