IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No.29216 of 2025

Chittaranjan Sethy …. **Petitioner**

Mr. K.K. Rout, Advocate

-Versus-

Odisha Information Commission, Bhubaneswar & others …. **Opposite Parties**

Mr. M.K. Mohanty, ASC
Mr. B.K. Dash, Advocate

CORAM:
MR. JUSTICE R.K. PATTANAIK

ORDER
15.01.2026

Order No.

02. 1. Heard learned counsel for the respective parties.

2. Instant writ petition is filed by the petitioner challenging the impugned order dated 13th September, 2025 as at Annexure-6 with a direction to the State Information Commission to dispose of the appeals within a stipulated period.

3. As per the applications/appeals at Annexure-1 series, the petitioner moved the authority concerned seeking supply of information under the RTI Act and it was disposed of vide Annexure-6, which is under challenge. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, the impugned order dated 13th September, 2025 i.e. Annexure-6 is a cryptic one and that apart, all the applications have been disposed of claiming it to be repeated ones. The submission is that some of the

information has been provided but not entirely while considering the request received vide Annexure-1 series. That apart, the contention is that opposite party No.1 could not have debarred the petitioner in making applications in future with restriction imposed, as revealed from Annexure-6, hence, therefore, the impugned decision dated 13th September, 2025 is liable to be interfered with and set aside.

4. Recorded the submission of Mr. Dash, learned counsel for opposite party No.1 and also Mr. Mohanty, learned ASC for the State appearing for opposite party Nos.2 to 4.

5. The applications as per Annexure-1 series were received from the petitioner by opposite party No.2 and as against the same, the appeals were carried vide Annexure-2 series. The copies of the appeal memorandums are at Annexure-3 series. Considering the complaints, the decision in appeals vide order dated 13th September, 2025 was taken by opposite party No.1 and dismissed the same on the premise that the information sought for is repetitive. Considering the conduct of the petitioner, opposite party No.1 further debarred him from filing any further applications for a period of one year with immediate effect, however, allowing 12 applications in the maximum under the RTI Act in a calendar year. Mr. Rout, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that such a restriction imposed by opposite party No.1 is not legally tenable. The further claim is that the petitioner has not been supplied the details of the information as applied vide Annexure-1 series.

6. Mr. Dash, learned counsel for opposite party No.1 and Mr. Mohanty, learned ASC for the State justify the impugned decision as per Annexure-6.

7. On a reference to the applications at Annexure-1 series and details of the information sought for, it is made to reveal that the entire of the information has not been provided to the petitioner and therefore, this Court is of the humble view that excepting the ones already supplied, the rest should be shared with the petitioner considering the applications as per Annexure-1 series. The Court is also of the view that the restriction imposed on the petitioner not to make any further applications under the RTI Act in a calendar year but allowing 12 applications only in a year before various public authorities is not justified. In other words, the Court is of the conclusion that opposite party No.1 could not have imposed such a restriction on the petitioner even though he is in the habit of filing number of applications seeking information under the RTI Act and therefore, to that extent, the impugned order at Annexure-6 is liable to be set aside with the direction to opposite party No.2 to supply the balance of the information considering Annexure-1 series.

8. Accordingly, it is ordered.

9. In the result, the writ petition stands disposed of with the direction as aforesaid. As a necessary corollary, the impugned order dated 13th September, 2025 at Annexure-6 by opposite party No.1 is hereby set aside to the extent as aforesaid.

10. Issue urgent certified copy as per rules.

(R.K. Pattanaik)
Judge

Alok