



2026:DHC:1563



\$~102

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

+ **W.P.(C) 2357/2026 and CM APPL. 11431/2026**

Date of Decision: **19.02.2026**

RAJESH DHANDA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aditya Chopra, Advocate

versus

CENTRAL PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER, CBI, ANTI  
CORRUPTION BRANCH & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anupam S Sharma, Ms.  
Harpreet Kalsi, Mr. Ripudamn  
Sharma, Mr. Vashisht Rao, Ms. Riya  
Sachdeva, Ms. Amisha P Dash, Mr.  
Deepak Rawat, Advocates.

**CORAM:**

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

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

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

1. The petition is for following reliefs:

*a. Issue a writ of Certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order, or direction quashing the Order dated 15.05.2025 passed by the Central Information Commission in Second Appeal No. CIC/BRUI/A/2024/622250;*

*b. Issue a writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction directing the Respondent No. 1 to furnish the said information sought vide Petitioner's Application dated 26.03.2024 under the RTI Act; or*

*c. In the alternate, issue a writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction directing the Hon'ble CIC to consider the Second Appeal afresh and pass a reasoned Order as per law; and*

*d. Pass such order and any further orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case.*



2026:DHC:1563



2. The petitioner seems to have filed an application under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) with respondent no. 1 - Central Public Information Officer (CPIO), Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI), seeking certain information.

3. Respondent no. 1 (CPIO, CBI) issued a reply dated 18.04.2024 rejecting the petitioner's application. Aggrieved by the rejection, the petitioner had filed first appeal under section 19(1) of the RTI Act, before respondent no.2 appellate authority (CBI). However, the same was rejected by respondent no.2, stating that the reply has been given by the CPIO and finding no merit in the appeal.

4. Thereafter, petitioner filed second appeal under Section 19(3) of RTI Act, before Central Information Commission (CIC), whereby, *vide* order dated 15.05.2025 CIC passed the impugned order allegedly without affording reasonable opportunity of hearing. The hearing of second appeal took place on 06.05.2025 pursuant thereto, impugned order dated 15.05.2025 was passed.

5. Petitioner submits that prior to the date of hearing that was fixed for 06.05.2025 the petitioner had sent an email communication dated 03.05.2025 requesting for an adjournment due to bereavement in his family. The material portion of the email is extracted as under:

*“To  
Hon’ble Commissioner Respected Ms. Anandi Remalingam,  
Central Information Commission,  
New Delhi*

*Subject: Request for Rescheduling of Hearing in File  
No.CIC/CBRUI/2024/622250*

*Hon’ble Ladyship,*



2026:DHC:1563



*I acknowledge receipt of your notice regarding the hearing scheduled on 06.05.2025 in the above-mentioned file. However, I regret to inform you that my father-in-law has recently passed away, and I have no brother-in-law to assist with the last rites and rituals.*

*As such, I am required to travel to Haridwar on 06.05.2025, other rituals and the Bhog Ceremony is scheduled to be held at Pehowa, Kurushetra and ISKCON Temple Ludhiana on 07.05.2025 and 08.05.2025.*

*In view of these unavoidable personal obligations, I kindly request that the hearing be rescheduled to any date thereafter at your convenience.*

*I shall remain grateful for your kind consideration.*

*Warm regards,  
Rajesh Dhanda  
9815813955”*

6. The sole grievance of the petitioner appears to be non-affording of reasonable opportunity of hearing before the impugned order was passed. Though, the Court does not consider the e-mail communication to constitute sufficient compliance for the purpose of adjournment, however, under the facts of the present case, where the sole grievance of the petitioner pertains to non-hearing, this Court deems it appropriate to remit the matter back to the CIC with directions to decide the appeal afresh after affording due opportunity of hearing to both the parties, in accordance with law.

7. The impugned order stands set aside only on that account. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed of. Pending application also stands disposed of.

8. All rights and contentions are left open.

**(PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV)  
JUDGE**

**FEBURARY 19, 2025**

tr/amg