



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

Date of decision: 19th DECEMBER, 2023

IN THE MATTER OF:

+ **W.P.(C) 11820/2021 & CM APPLs. 38010/2022, 38023/2022, 46873/2023**

SHISHIR CHAND

..... Petitioner

Through: Petitioner-in-Person

versus

THE CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Rakesh Kumar, CGSC with Mr. Sunil, Advocate for CIC.

Mr. T Singhdev, Mr. Tanishq Srivastava, Mr. Abhijit Chakravarty, Mr. Bhanu Gulati, Ms. Anum Hussain, Mr. Aabhaas Sukhramani, Ms. Ramanpreet Kaur, Advocates for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD

JUDGMENT

1. By way of the present Writ Petition, the Petitioner herein seeks to challenge the Order dated 19.08.2021, passed by the Central Information Commission, rejecting the appeal filed by the Petitioner and further directing the Registry of the Commission not to entertain any further cases from the Petitioner herein on the same subject matter on the ground that the Petitioner has abused the process of Right to Information.
2. The facts leading up to the instant case are that the Petitioner herein filed an RTI application on 01.05.2019 seeking the following information:



“1. A certified copy of Minutes of Meetings of Ethics Committee that took up this instant appeal during its meeting held on 16.11.2018 with deliberations/discussions/findings of the Ethics Committee on the four broad points listed below.

A. Presenting complaints of Vishal Chand in the emergency ward of Tata Main Hospital, Jamshedpur viz complaint of uneasiness and chest pain.

B. Presenting symptoms/clinical findings of Vishal Chand in the Emergency Ward of Tata Main Hospital, Jamshedpur viz High B.P of 150/100 and irregular and abnormal E.C.G with multiple ischemic changes in several nodes as opined by Dr. R. K. Sharma of AIIMS, a cardiologist Dr. Dipak Das of Cuttack, Orissa and Dr. Ravikumar Bhaskaran, Trivandnim, Kerela, all three on affidavit and part of the case record.

C. The importance of probing family history of such a patient having presenting symptoms and clinical findings suggestive of cardio vascular event and impending heart attack.

D. Standard Treatment Guidelines to be followed in such a case in light of appellant's repeated submission to MCI viz guidelines for treating cardiovascular disease issued by Union Health Ministry, New Delhi; JIPMER, Puducherry and Dhirubhai Ambani Hospital, Mumbai.

2. Did the Ethics Committee of MCI reconstituted under Board of Governors on 26.09.2018 considered appellant's detailed submission of 110 pages submitted in person as paper book at MCI office at Dwarka, New Delhi on 10.10.2018 in response to MCI's letter No. 211(2)(83-Appeal) /2013/Ethics-138371 dt. 21.09.2018 calling upon the Appellant to appear before Ethics Committee of MCI on 10.10.2018?”



3. The Central Public Information Officer (CPIO) by Order dated 11.06.2019 furnished a para-wise reply to the Applicant, attaching a copy of the Minutes of Meeting of the Ethics Sub-Committee. Further, the CPIO *vide* letter dated 14.06.2019 furnished a certified copy of the resignation letter dated 13.02.2019 of Dr. Sanjay Shrivastava, Secretary-General of the Medical Council of India, Board of Governors.

4. Dissatisfied with the response from the CPIO, the Petitioner filed a First Appeal on 17.06.2019. During the pendency of the First Appeal, the Petitioner approached the CIC by filing a Second Appeal. The CIC held that the facts of the case are squarely covered by the earlier decisions passed by the Coordinate Bench of the CIC. The CIC was of the opinion that the information sought in the present case arises due to untimely demise of the younger brother of the Petitioner on account of alleged medical negligence of Dr. Atul Chhabra of Tata Memorial Hospital, Jamshedpur. The CIC enumerated the list of RTI applications filed by the Petitioner and the repeated attempts on the part of the Petitioner to reopen the same issue again and again, and held that the decisions already adjudicated by the CIC with respect to the same subject matter have been considered from all aspects by the CIC and that substantial amount of information has been made available with the Petitioner. It was held that since the ambit of RTI Act is restricted to ensure access to information from existing public records, the CIC finds that enough relief under the RTI Act has already been explored. The CIC was of the opinion that a trial of medical negligence cannot be held through the process of RTI. The CIC, therefore, directed the Registry not to entertain



any further cases from the Petitioner on the same subject matter. This Order is under challenge in the instant writ petition.

5. Shorn of unnecessary details, the facts, leading to the present Writ Petition, are as under:

- a. It is stated that on 20.05.2011 the younger brother of the Petitioner herein experienced chest pain and was rushed to the emergency ward of Tata Main Hospital, Jamshedpur, Jharkhand, where he was attended to by Dr. Atul Chhabra (*hereinafter referred to as 'the Doctor in question'*). It is stated that the Petitioner's brother passed away on the next day, i.e. 21.05.2011. It is stated that the Petitioner's family filed a consumer case, bearing No.83/2013, on 04.04.2013 against the Doctor in question before the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission (*hereinafter referred to as 'the NCDRC'*). It is stated that an appeal was also filed by the Petitioner before the Medical Council of India for revoking the licence of the Doctor in question.
- b. Material on record also discloses that the Petitioner has also filed an FIR, being FIR No.164/2014 dated 04.05.2014, registered at Police Station Bistupur, Jamshedpur, against the General Manager, Medical Services, Tata Steel, under Section 304 IPC.
- c. The Petitioner has also approached various forums and Courts challenging the degrees obtained by the Doctor in question and also questioned the treatment provided by the said Doctor to his younger brother. Instead of going into the details of each and



every RTI application filed by the Petitioner before various authorities, a table demonstrating the same reads as under:

| S.No. | Date of filing RTI Application | Information Demanded | Information sought from |
|-------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| 1 | 27.12.2014 | Seeking information regarding admission of Dr. Atul Chhabra in MBBS course. | Medical Council of India |
| 2 | 27.12.2014 | Seeking reasons for the decision of the Ethics Committee dated 12.12.2014. | Medical Council of India |
| 3 | 02.12.2015 | Seeking copy of MBBS degree of Dr. Atul Chhabra. | Medical Council of India |
| 4 | 01.03.2016 | Seeking information on the authenticity of MBBS degree of Dr. Atul Chhabra through Bihar Medical Council. | Medical Council of India |



| | | | |
|---|------------|--|--------------------------|
| 5 | 09.09.2017 | Seeking list of documents perused by the Ethics Committee on the basis of which a warning was issued to Dr. Atul Chhabra. | Medical Council of India |
| 6 | 30.06.2018 | Seeking letter dated 26.03.2018 issued to Dr. Atul Chhabra seeking his comments on the issue of his fake degree. | Medical Council of India |
| 7 | 27.08.2018 | Seeking findings of MCI in respect of the MBBS qualification of Dr. Atul Chhabra in reference with the affidavit filed by Ranchi University. | Medical Council of India |
| 8 | 01.05.2019 | Seeking findings / reasons of Ethics Committee meeting dated 16.11.2018 when it was decided to | Medical Council of India |



| | | | |
|--|------------|--|---|
| | | reiterate the earlier decision of issuing warning to Dr. Atul Chhabra. | |
| RTI APPLICATIONS TO THE OTHER AUTHORITIES | | | |
| 9 | 06.10.2012 | Seeking information on protocol for management of patients complaining of chest pain/uneasiness. | Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, GOI transferred RTI to All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi. |
| 10 | 10.06.2017 | Seeking application form and enrolment form filled by Dr. Atul Chhabra to appear in the CBSE All India Pre Medical Pre Dental Entrance | Central Board of Secondary Education, Delhi. |



| | | | |
|----|------------|--|---|
| | | Examination in the year 1989-90 on the basis of which he was granted admission in MBBS. | |
| 11 | 08.07.2017 | Seeking information regarding procedure to verify educational qualification degree submitted by a medical doctor alongwith SOP followed by CBI in such cases. | Central Bureau of Investigation |
| 12 | 03.11.2017 | Seeking information on the Expert Medical Opinion of a Medical Board constituted at AIIMS, New Delhi on the request of CB, CID, Jharkhand Police to assist the investigating agency in filing the charge sheet in the criminal | All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi. |



| | | | |
|----|------------|--|--|
| | | case against Dr. Atul Chhabra. | |
| 13 | 05.01.2018 | Seeking merit list of successful candidates who had cleared the AIPMT Exam of 1989 for admission to MBBS course. | Directorate General of Health Services, Medical Examination Cell |
| 14 | 05.01.2018 | Seeking information regarding status of his criminal complaint dated 18.12.2017 against members of Medical Council of India, Dr. Atul Chhabra and his Advocate, Mr. Punit Tyagi under Section 120B,409 and 420 of IPC. | Central Bureau of Investigation |
| 15 | 17.06.2018 | Seeking following information in respect of roster of the | National Consumer Disputes |



| | | | |
|--|--|---|---------------------------------|
| | | Hon'ble Judges of NCDRC and the justification for transfer of an Hon'ble Judge from one Court to another. | Redressal Commission, New Delhi |
|--|--|---|---------------------------------|

d. Aggrieved by the Order of the Medical Council of India (MCI) by only awarding the punishment to Dr. Atul Chhabra, the Petitioner had approached this Court by filing a W.P. (C) No. 277/2017. In the said writ petition, the Petitioner also challenged the degree granted to Dr. Atul Chhabra. This Court by Order dated 30.08.2017 rejected the submission of the Petitioner regarding the degree of Dr. Atul Chhabra. The said Order dated 30.08.2017 reads as under:

“4. Respondent no.2 has also produced the original degree dated 16.04.1998 awarded to him, which indicates that respondent no.2 had passed the Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery Examination held in the month of April 1995. He has also produced the original certificate of registration of respondent no.2 with the Bihar Council of Medical Registration. It appears that some confusion was caused because the final examination is termed as the final examination 1994, although it was held in April 1995. The same is apparent from the degree issued to respondent no.2. In this view, this Court does not find that there is any reason to further verify the medical qualifications of respondent no.2. The said prayer is, accordingly, rejected.”



- e. The said writ petition being W.P. (C) No. 277/2017 was finally rejected by an Order dated 05.09.2017 by directing the MCI to re-consider the matter afresh. The said Order dated 05.09.2017 was challenged by filing an LPA No.693/2017 which was rejected by vide Order dated 26.04.2018. A review petition being Review Pet. No.246/2018 was also filed against the said Order which was also rejected *vide* Order dated 06.07.2018. The said Order dated 06.07.2018 was challenged before the Hon'ble Apex Court by filing an SLP being Special Leave Petition (Civil) Diary No(s). 41865/2018 which was also dismissed by the Hon'ble Apex Court *vide* Order dated 22.11.2018.
- f. Material on record discloses that in compliance of the Order dated 05.09.2017, the Ethics Committee considered the matter in its meeting held on 10.10.2017 wherein it was recorded as under:

“The Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 10th October, 2017 considered the matter and noted that the above decision was approved by the Executive Committee of the Council at its meeting held on 15.06.2016 and the same was communicated to Mr. Shishir Chand vide Council letter dated 21.07.2016.

The Committee further considered the order dated 05.09.2017 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi. The operative part of the Order is as under:-

*“.....
12. Keeping the above facts in mind, this Court is of the view that it is apposite that MCI examine*



the matter afresh and take an informed view after hearing the petitioner as well as respondent no. 2. MCI may also seek an expert opinion, if necessary.

13. The impugned order passed by MCI is, accordingly, set aside and the concerned Committee of MCI is directed to rehear the concerned parties and take a decision afresh uninfluenced by the decisions rendered earlier.

14. The petition is, accordingly, disposed of"

The Committee further deliberated upon the matter in detail and after detailed deliberation is of the unanimous opinion that as directed by the Hon'ble Court the case needs to be re-opened and directed the section to call both the parties- the appellant Mr. Shishir Chand and the respondent doctor Dr. Atul Chhabra in the next/subsequent meeting of the Ethics Committee.

The Ethics Committee further considered the matter and noted that the Council office vide its letter dated 30.01.2018 directed the appellant Mr. Shishir Chand and the respondent doctor Dr. Atul Chhabra to appear before the Ethics Committee at its meeting scheduled to be held on 15.02.2018 along with all the relevant documents pertaining to the matter.

The Ethics Committee noted that in pursuance to the Council letter dated 30.01.2018 Mr. Shishir Chand sent a letter dated 05.02.2018 inter alia stating that he would not like to be part of the proceeding before the Ethics Committee and would prefer to wait until the decision of the division bench of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in LPA no. 693 of 2017 filed by him.



Further on 15.02.2018 Mr. Punit D. Tyagi, Advocate for Dr. Atul Chhabra appeared and submitted an application requesting for a copy of the appeal filed by Sh. Shishir Chand along with all documents being relied upon in the appeal and further requested for 2 weeks time to submit his written statement.

The Ethics Committee unanimously decided that since there is no order direction by the Hon'ble division bench of the Delhi High Court regarding any stay on the present proceedings, the proceedings before the Ethics Committee shall continue even if the appellant chooses to wait until the decision of the Hon'ble Division bench of the Delhi High Court. Further the Committee directed the Ethics Section that a copy of the fresh appeal alongwith the all supporting documents be provided to Dr. Atul Chhabra and directed Dr. Atul Chhabra to submit his written statement on or before the next date to be fixed in the matter.

The Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 30th and 31st August, 2018 further considered the matter and noted that as per the above decision of the Ethics Committee, the Council office vide its letter dated 26.03.2018 requested Dr. Atul Chhabra to provide his written submission in the form of affidavit with documentary proof within a period of 15 days from the date of dispatch of the letter. A reminder was also sent on 20.06.2018.

The Committee further noted that in reply, Sh. Punit D. Tyagi, Counsel for the respondent doctor, vide his letter dated 27.06.2018 has informed that they had already filed the written submission on 11.04.2018 on behalf of Dr. Atul Chhabra, which is kept in record.



The Committee further noted that a note dated 23.08.2018 from the Legal Section of the Council enclosed therewith a letter dated 13.07.2018 from the Admn. Officer Judl (Writs) for Registrar General, High Court of Delhi forwarding therewith order dated 06.07.2018 passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the above captioned matter. The enclosed court order is self-explanatory. However, the Court order dated 06.07.2018 reads as under:-

"After hearing the learned counsel for the Petitioner, we find the no ground is made out to review the order.

The review petition filed by the Petitioner is therefore, dismissed."

The Ethics Committee further discussed the matter and deliberated upon the matter at length and noted that in pursuance to the Council letter dated 30.01.2018 whereby Mr. Shishir Chand was asked to appear before the Ethics Committee at its meeting scheduled to be held on 15.02.2018, he had sent a letter dated 05.02.2018 interalia stating that he would not like to be part of the proceeding before the Ethics Committee and would prefer to wait until the decision of the division bench of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in LPA no. 693 of 2017 filed by him.

Further the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 15.02.2018 unanimously decided that since there is no order/ direction by the Hon' ble division bench of the Delhi High Court regarding any stay on the present proceedings, the proceedings before the Ethics Committee shall continue even if the appellant chooses to wait



until the decision of the Hon'ble Division bench of the Delhi High Court.

The Committee now noted that the High Court of Delhi vide their order dated 06.07.2018 has already decided the matter and have decided to dismiss the review petition filed by the Petitioner.

Further the Committee directed the Ethics Section that an opportunity of hearing be granted to both the parties-- the appellant. Mr. Shishir Chand and the respondent doctor Dr. Atul Chhabra. The Ethics Committee further decided to call both the parties to appear before the Ethics Committee in its next/subsequent meeting."

- g. The matter was then considered by the Ethics Committee at its various meetings and the present Ethics Committee formed under the Board of Governors reconsidered the matter in its meeting held on 16.11.2018. The relevant portion of the proceedings reads as under:

"...the Ethics Committee considered the matter and noted the order of the Delhi High Court for examining the matter afresh after hearing both the parties.

The Ethics Committee further noted that the Council office vide its letter dated 06.11.2018 directed Dr. Atul Chhabra and Sh. Shishir Chand to appear before the Ethics Committee on 16.11.2018 alongwith all the relevant documents pertaining to the matter.

The respondent doctor Dr. Atul Chhabra appeared before the Committee on 16.11.2018, the Committee heard him in detail and directed



him to submit his statement, to which he complied. Further, the appellant Sh. Shishir Chand vide letter dated 12.11.2018 informed the Committee that he would not be participating in the proceedings of the Medical Council of India as his SLP against order of Delhi High Court is pending before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

The Committee deliberated upon the matter at length and observed the following:

> The patient Mr. Vishal Chand visited Tata Main Hospital, Jamshedpur on 20.05.2011 and was given treatment by Dr. Atul Chhabra.

> Dr. Mul Chhabra in his statement submitted before the Ethics Committee has further enclosed a copy of the ECG report of the patient taken on 20.05.2011. The ECG did not show any definite evidence of coronary artery disease at that time.

In view of above, the Ethics Committee decided to reiterate the decision of the erstwhile Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 18th & 19th July 2014 of issuing warning to Dr. Atul Chhabra."

- h. The aforesaid finding is not a subject matter of challenge in any further proceedings and has attained finality.
- i. A perusal of the chart shows that the Petitioner has been repeatedly trying to question the degree of Dr. Atul Chhabra despite this Court, *vide* Order dated 30.08.2017, in W.P. (C) No. 277/2017, having held that the said Doctor has requisite qualification and the said Order has attained finality inasmuch



as the same has been upheld by the Division Bench of this Court *vide* its Order dated 26.04.2018 in LPA No.693/2017. It is pertinent to mention that a Review Petition, being Review Pet. No.246/2018, was also filed before the Division Bench and the same has also been dismissed by this Court *vide* its Order dated 06.07.2018 and the SLP filed by the Petitioner, being SLP (C) No. 41865/2018, challenging the Order passed by the Division Bench, has also been dismissed *vide* Order dated 22.11.2018.

- j. Even though the matter has attained finality, the Petitioner herein has kept on seeking information in some way or the other to implicate Dr. Atul Chhabra. In fact, material on record also shows that the Order dated 16.11.2018 passed by the Ethics Committee has not been challenged and instead the Petitioner has sought to question the proceedings of the Ethics Committee by seeking the documents placed before the Ethics Committee and later by filing an application dated 01.05.2019 seeking findings and reasons of the Ethics Committee when the Committee decided to reiterate its earlier decision.
- k. On 27.08.2018 the Petitioner filed an RTI Application seeking findings of the MCI in respect of the MBBS qualification of Dr. Atul Chhabra in reference with the affidavit filed by Ranchi University. *Vide* application dated 01.05.2019 the Petitioner has sought for findings/reasons of the Ethics Committee meeting dated 16.11.2018 as to why the punishment of issuing only a warning to Dr. Atul Chhabra has been given. *Vide* RTI



Application dated 06.10.2012 the Petitioner has sought information on protocol for management of patients complaining of chest pain/ uneasiness from the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. The Petitioner has also sought for the application form and enrolment form filled by Dr. Atul Chhabra to appear in the CBSE All India Pre Medical Pre Dental Entrance Examination in the year 1989-90, on the basis of which he was granted admission in MBBS.

1. The Petitioner has also filed an RTI with the CBI and has sought information regarding procedure to verify educational qualification degree submitted by a medical doctor along with the standard operating procedure followed by the CBI in such cases. The Petitioner has also sought for information on the Expert Medical Opinion of a Medical Board constituted at AIIMS, New Delhi on the request of CB, CID, Jharkhand Police to assist the investigating agency in filing the charge sheet in the criminal case against Dr. Atul Chhabra. By way of an RTI dated 05.01.2018, the Petitioner herein has also sought for the merit list of successful candidates who had cleared the AIPMT Exam of 1989 for admission to MBBS course from the Directorate General of Health Services, Examination Cell. The Petitioner has also sought information regarding status of his criminal complaint dated 18.12.2017 against members of Medical Council of India, Dr. Atul Chhabra and his Advocate, Mr. Punit Tyagi, which was filed under Sections 120B, 409 and 420 of the Indian Penal Code. The Petitioner has gone to the



extent of filing an RTI application dated 17.06.2018 seeking information from the NCDRC in respect of roster of the Judges of NCDRC and the justification for transfer of a Judge from one Court to another. The CIC disposed of the appeal observing as under:-

"In the light of the aforementioned facts discussed at length, it is noted that while information as defined under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act has been furnished by the Respondent, what the Appellant seeks to obtain is justification of the alleged addition, deletion, modification, correction made by Dr. Gurpreet Wander to the proceedings of the Appellant's case. Records of the case reveal that Respondent has tried to answer the queries of the Appellant, though the Appellant is not satisfied with the reply. Respondent- Ms. Juneja has sought time to revisit the queries and search if any possible information is available, with the newly constituted National Medical Commission. The Respondent is granted six weeks to trace if any further information, if available on record which can be provided to the Appellant in terms of the RTI Act.

PIO shall submit a compliance report before the Commission by 10.10.2021, with respect to the above directions upon sending the Appellant, additional information if any found by her from the official records."

- m. While hearing an appeal filed by the Petitioner, the CIC, by the order impugned herein, barred the Petitioner from filing any further applications against any public authority on the subject matter of his brother's death.
- n. The Petitioner has, thereafter, approached this Court by filing the present Writ Petition.



6. Right to Information Act, 2005 was brought out with a laudable objective of bringing about transparency in the functioning of the Government. The Act was brought into to provide for secure access to information to every citizen, and to prevent corruption and to hold Governments and their instrumentalities accountable. However, this Court is now seeing increasing abuse/misuse of the RTI Act and this case is a classic case of abuse of the Right to Information. The purpose of the RTI Act is meant to further good governance, and unfortunate misuse of the same will only dilute its importance as well as make government servants dither from carrying out their activities. It will also prevent doctors from taking steps in emergent situations fearing the consequences of the same. This Court has unfortunately been coming across various cases where abuse of RTI has led to paralysis and fear among Government officials.

7. A perusal of the queries raised in the RTI application reveals that the Petitioner has once again attempted to extract information regarding the findings and reasoning of the Ethics Committee rather than challenging the Order of the Ethics Committee. Undoubtedly, the Petitioner is abusing the Right to Information Act by repeatedly filing applications by either trying to ascertain the degree of Dr. Atul Chhabra, the issue which has already attained finality by the Orders of this Court as well as the Apex Court, or by trying to question the decision making process adopted by the Ethics Committee.

8. The Ld. CIC by the Impugned Order notes that the information sought by the Petitioner has been furnished by the Respondent/PIO, National Medical Commission and what the Petitioner seeks to obtain is the justification of the alleged addition, deletion, modification and correction



made to the proceedings of the case of the Petitioner. The Ld. CIC was of the opinion that records of the case reveal that the Respondent/PIO National Medical Commission had tried to answer the queries of the Petitioner, however, the Petitioner was not satisfied with the reply. The Ld. CIC was considerate enough to direct the Respondent/PIO National Medical Commission to revisit the queries and see if any further information was available on record which could be provided to the Petitioner and for which the Respondent/PIO National Medical Commission was directed to submit a compliance report before the CIC by 10.10.2021. The said portion of the Order does not require any interference.

9. However, the question which arises for consideration before this Court is whether the CIC can restrain the Petitioner from making further queries under the RTI Act by directing the Central Registry of the Commission not to entertain any further cases from the Petitioner on the same subject matter ?

10. The Right to Information Act, 2005 has been brought about for providing greater and more effective access to information to the citizens. Though the Petitioner has been abusing the process of RTI, it is the duty of the authorities to provide information and when the information stands provided then there is no necessity to provide the same information. However, if further information is sought, then the right of the person cannot be extinguished. In fact, the RTI Act does not provide for dismissal of an application with costs. Information which has already been furnished need not be furnished again, and the application can be rejected on this ground. However, a citizen's right to claim information under RTI Act cannot be doused if further or fresh information is sought. The RTI Act provides for



payment of costs by public authority if any loss is caused or any other detriment is suffered by the complainant or if the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, without any reasonable cause, fails to receive an application for information or has not furnished information within the time specified or has given incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or destroyed information which was the subject of the request or obstructed in any manner in furnishing the information. There is no provision for imposing costs if information is sought repeatedly.

11. In the present case, this Court is of the opinion that the Petitioner has not sought for the same information but has only sought further information, and therefore, the Ld. CIC ought not to have passed the direction to the Central Registry of the Commission not to entertain any further cases from the Petitioner herein on the same subject matter.

12. In view of the above, this Court is, therefore, inclined to set aside the relevant portion of the Order of the Ld. CIC by which the Ld. CIC has directed the Central Registry of the Commission not to entertain any further cases from the Petitioner herein on the same subject matter. The Court is sympathetic to the pain of the Petitioner, however, the Petitioner is advised not to abuse the process of law by trying to seek the same information over and over again, thereby diluting the very objective of the Act.

13. The Writ Petition is allowed in part. Pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD, J

DECEMBER 19, 2023

Rahul