

\$~7

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

+ W.P.(C) 3883/2022

VEENA JOSHI

..... Petitioner

Through: Dr. Dilip Kr, Adv. for applicant

versus

CPIO,CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ruchir Mishra and Mr. Mukesh  
Tiwari, Advs. for UOI

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHWANT VARMA**

**ORDER**

% **12.07.2022**

1. This writ petition is directed against an order of 28 September 2021 in terms of which an application made by the petitioner purporting to invoke the provisions of the Right to Information Act, 2005 has come to be rejected.
2. From a perusal of the application as tendered, it transpires that the petitioner was essentially aggrieved by non-completion of certain civil works in a government quarter which had been allotted to him. It was in that connection that the provisions of the Act were sought to be invoked.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the inspection of premises and properties would fall within the ambit of the Act in light of the provisions made in Section 2(j). According to learned counsel, the use of the word "*work*" in Section 2(j) would indicate that the provisions of the Act could extend to the prayers as made and laid before the respondents.
4. In the considered opinion of this Court, the aforesaid submission is thoroughly misconceived for the following reasons.
5. The Act essentially confers a right on citizens to seek information. It

enables them to secure information that may be within the control and possession of public authorities. When Section 2(j) uses the word “*work*”, it is referring to the inspection of documents and records and it is in that light that the said phrase is liable to be understood. The word “work” is to be read in conjunction with the expressions “*documents*” and “*records*”. It thus must necessarily draw color therefrom.

6. As this Court construes the provisions of the Act, it is manifest that the application that was made was thoroughly misconceived.

7. The writ petition consequently must also suffer a similar fate. It shall accordingly stand dismissed with costs quantified at Rs.5,000/- to be deposited at Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee [DHCLSC].

**YASHWANT VARMA, J.**

**JULY 12, 2022/***neha*