



\$~90

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

+ **W.P.(C) 5403/2012 and CM APPL. 11016/2012**

UNION OF INDIA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ruchir Mishra, Mr. Sanjiv Kr. Saxena, Mr. Mukesh Kr Tiwari, Ms. Reba Jena Mishra and Ms. Poonam Shukla, Advs.

versus

MOHAN DHANSING CHAVHAN

.....Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

08.04.2026

1. The instant petition has been filed seeking following reliefs:

*“a) pass appropriate writ, directions or order in the nature of certiorari or any other writ, direction or order quashing the impugned order dated 27.06.2012 passed by Ld. Central Information Commission in Appeal No.CIC/SS/A/2011/001339;
b) Such other and further direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts of the case.”*

2. The sole grievance of the petitioner is that Central Information Commission (**hereinafter “CIC”**) vide order dated 27.06.2012 has directed disclosure of Renke Commission Report under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (**hereinafter “RTI Act”**).

3. The facts of the case would indicate that an application dated 21.02.2011 was filed by the respondent under the RTI Act seeking a copy of the Renke Commission Report and action taken thereon. The Central Public



Information Officer (**hereinafter “CPIO”**) rejected the request on 23.03.2011 on the ground that the report was under examination and cannot be made available in the public domain.

4. *Vide* order dated 27.06.2012 the CIC, in the second appeal, directed disclosure of the Renke Commission Report. Thereafter, *vide* order dated 15.10.2012 this Court directed for stay of the CIC’s order and subsequently, the stay order was confirmed on 09.09.2013.

5. It be noted that despite service of notice, the RTI applicant is not represented throughout the proceeding. Since he was not being represented, therefore, the Court has proceeded *ex parte* against him.

6. This Court *vide* order dated 06.04.2026 directed the petitioner to take the instructions whether the deliberations *qua* the report have been completed or otherwise. The petitioner submits that the instructions have not yet been received.

7. Be that as it may, the matter relates to RTI application filed in the year 2011 which related to the Commission setup by the Government at a relevant point of time. By this time the report might have been considered by the Government and the same would have been taken to its logical conclusion.

8. The RTI applicant, therefore, is granted liberty to file a fresh application before the concerned Public Information Officer (**hereinafter “PIO”**). Let the same be dealt with in accordance with law.

9. So far as the findings by the CIC with respect to the grant of information notwithstanding the pending consideration of the recommendations are concerned, the same cannot be sustained in the eyes of law.



10. It be noted that unless the Commission recommendations are placed before the concerned Government and the decision is taken, the same should not be supplied under the RTI Act.
11. For all those reasons the impugned order stands set aside. Liberty to the RTI applicants as stated above stands granted.
12. The instant petition along with pending application stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

APRIL 8, 2026/Sh