



\$~14

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

+ **W.P.(C) 17036/2025 and CM APPL. 70088/2025**

MANOJ KUMAR SINGHAL & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr Virendra Singh, Advocate.
versus

PUBLIC GRIEVANCES COMMISSION & ORS. ...Respondents

Through: Mr. Harshit Chopra, Mr. Khushal
Chand Agarwal and Ms. Swati Tiwari
Advocates for R2 MCD
Mr Ashwin Vaish, Shubhi Yashaswi
Uttam Aaditya Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

10.02.2026

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

“a) A Writ of Certiorari or any other appropriate Writ, Order or Direction, thereby quashing the impugned order dated 19.09.2025 passed by the Respondent No. 1/Public Grievance Commission (PGC) in Appeal Nos.2945-2948/2025 filed by the Respondent No.3.

b) Pass any other such order (s) which this Hon'ble Court deems fit and appropriate in the facts and circumstances of the case and in the interest of justice.”

2. The facts of the case indicate that the petitioners and respondent no. 3 have pending litigation between them, including criminal cases. As per the petitioner, respondent no. 3 is a retired Engineer from the Public Works Department. In this context, respondent no. 3 had filed an application under the Delhi Right to Information Act, 2001 (DRTI Act) before respondent no. 2-competent authority, seeking information pertaining to the work executed



by one M.K. Constructions, which is a partnership firm of the petitioners. The petitioners had objected to disclosure of the said information on the ground that the same was exempted under Section 8(d), 8(g), and 8(j) of the Right to Information Act, 2005. Respondent no. 2 had, in turn, refused to disclose the information sought by respondent no. 2.

3. Aggrieved by the same, respondent no. 3 had preferred an appeal before the appellate authority under Section 7 of the DRTI Act. The appellate authority has noted that non-disclosure of information cannot be resorted to, merely on the ground that the same was voluminous. In the impugned order, respondent no. 2 has been directed to furnish to respondent no. 3 a revised reply to respondent no. 3's application within a maximum period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order.

4. A perusal of the impugned order indicates that the Corporation's case is not non-availability of the requested information. Further, it is seen that the directions to respondent no. 2 in the impugned order is to file a revised reply to the application and also provide all documents available as per its record, including documents for which respondent no. 3 had already paid the requisite fees.

5. Therefore, the Court does not find any illegality or infirmity in the order dated 19.09.2025.

6. So far as the submission of the petitioners there exists prior history between themselves and respondent no. 3 is concerned, the same cannot be the reason to deny disclosure of information to the latter under the DRTI Act, 2001 or the RTI Act, 2005. Under the scheme of the RTI Act, 2005, the applicant is not required to establish any *locus standi* for seeking information. Section 6(2) thereof, is extracted below, for reference:



“(2) An applicant making request for information shall not be required to give any reason for requesting the information or any other personal details except those that may be necessary for contacting him.”

7. If the Corporation has any other grievance, the same may be looked into by the concerned authority, as has already been directed in the impugned order. If the requested information is exempted from the scope of the RTI Act, 2005/DRTI Act, 2001, respondent no. 2 may consider the said aspect when complying with the impugned directions.

8. In view of the aforesaid, nothing more remains to be adjudicated in the instant case.

9. With the aforesaid observations, the instant petition stands disposed of along with all pending applications.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

FEBRUARY 10, 2026

Nc/amg