



2026:DHC:1404



\$~13

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ **W.P.(C) 3849/2025**

Date of Decision: 13.02.2026

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

BISWAJIT CHOWDHURY

.....Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

Versus

CPIO SUPREME COURT LEGAL SERVICES COMMITTEE & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Counsel (appearance not given)

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV**

**J U D G E M E N T**

**PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)**

The petitioner seems to have filed the application under Right to Information Act, 2005 (**hereinafter** "RTI Act") on 14.05.2023 seeking certain information.

2. This information essentially relates to the approved guidelines by the Supreme Court on conducting the mediation related to child access/custody, parenting and various other allied information.

3. The Chief Public Information officer, Supreme Court Legal Services Authorities, (**hereinafter** 'CPIO') *vide* letter dated 14.07.2023, replied to the petitioner. The petitioner being dissatisfied with the said reply filed the first



appeal and the First Appellate Authority of Supreme Court of India vide order dated 28.03.2023 has held that it is beyond the jurisdiction and scope of the duties of CPIO, Supreme Court of India under RTI to take action against any authority or to direct any authority to take action or to give information, opine, comment or advise on matters, etc.

4. It was also stated that an appropriate reply was furnished to the petitioner and no further information with that regard on the part of CPIO, Supreme Court of India was called for.

5. The petitioner being aggrieved by the said order approached the Second Appellate Authority, i.e., Central Information Commission (**hereinafter** 'CIC'). The CIC *vide* decision dated 06.11.2024, found that in light of the circumstances the CPIO, Supreme Court of India was directed to revisit the query faced by the petitioner and to furnish a point-wise reply providing accurate information regarding process of empanelment of mediators, parameters / guidelines followed for case allocation by the Supreme Court Legal Service Committee and information with respect to queries no. 2a, 3, 4 and 4b. It was also directed that the revised reply should contain specific and accurate information, but should not divulge any information expressly exempted within the provisions of the RTI Act. The respondents were also directed to send the revised reply to the petitioner within four weeks from receipt of the order and a compliance report was directed to be submitted to the CIC within one week thereafter. It was further stated that in the case of non adherence to the directions the penal action should attract.



6. For the sake of clarity, the material part of the CIC order dated 06.11.202, is extracted as under:

*“In the light of the circumstances of the case at hand, the Respondent – PIO is hereby directed to revisit the queries raised by the Appellant and furnish a point wise reply providing accurate information regarding process of empanelment of mediators, parameters / guidelines followed for case allocation by the Supreme Court Legal Services Committee and information with respect to queries number 2a), 3, 4, 4b). The revised reply should contain specific and accurate information, but should not divulge any information expressly exempt within the provisions of the RTI Act. The Respondent shall send the revised reply to the Appellant within four weeks of receipt of this order and a compliance report must be submitted by the Respondent – PIO, SCLSC before the Commission within one week thereafter. It is made clear that non adherence of the aforesaid directions shall attract penal action, as per law. The appeal is disposed off accordingly.”*

7. Petitioner in person submits that pursuant to the directions passed by the CIC, the petitioner was furnished incomplete, evasive and vague response by the respondent. He, therefore, submits that he immediately again approached the CIC, raising his grievance that the continued evasive and incomplete reply is causing undue hardship and mental harassment to the petitioner. According to him, the response thereto by the respondent was misleading.

8. The aforesaid submissions are vehemently opposed by learned counsel who appears for respondents. She takes the Court through the reply furnished *vide* letter dated 05.12.2024 and has read Annexure P-7, explaining that the information as was directed was duly supplied. She also submits that there is no reason to hide or retain any information which otherwise the petitioner is entitled to.



9. I have heard petitioner in person and learned counsel for the respondents.

10. The primary issue involved herein is with respect to alleged incomplete supply of the information sought by the petitioner. Under the provisions of Section 18(1)(e) of the RTI Act, it is provided that the CIC or State Information Commission (SIC), as the case may be, are fully empowered to enquire into a complaint by any person, who believes that he or she has been given incomplete / misleading or false information under the provision of the RTI Act. Furthermore, Sub-Section 2 of Section 18 provides that where the CIC or SIC as the case may be is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds to enquire into the matter, it may initiate an enquiry into the matter in respect thereof.

11. For the purpose of conducting the enquiry by virtue of Sub-Section 3, of Section 18 of RTI Act, the Commissions are vested with the powers of the Civil Court trying a suit under the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 with respect to certain matters as stipulated there.

12. Having considered the aforesaid provision, the Court finds that the provisions of the RTI Act are a complete code in itself and contains the answer, to the grievance raised by the petitioner.

13. So far as the submissions made by the petitioner that the CIC has not considered his concern appropriately, the Court reminds the CIC to its power and authority and directs that in case the CIC receives the complaint within a period of 15 days from today with respect to incomplete compliance of the directions already passed by the CIC, let the said



2026:DHC:1404



complaint be taken to its logical conclusion with due expedition not beyond 60 days from the date of receipt of the copy of the complaint.

14. The aforesaid exercise is necessary in order to ensure that the object of the RTI Act is fully achieved. It is pertinent to note herein that the petitioner seems to be litigating for the desired information from the year 2023, the undue delay would frustrate the provisions of the RTI Act.

15. With these observations, leaving all the questions open, the petition stands disposed of.

**PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J**

**FEBRUARY 13, 2026**

*Sh/mj*