

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

W.P. (C) 2234/2010

**MANISH KUMAR..... Petitioner
in person**

versus

**PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER
AND ANR.
Respondents
Through: Mr. Sanjeev Rajpal, Advocate**

CORAM : JUSTICE S. MURALIDHAR

**O R D E R
07.04.2010**

**CM No. 4528 of 2010
Exemption allowed subject to all just exceptions.
The application is disposed of.
W.P.(C) 2234/2010**

1. The Petitioner who appears in person is aggrieved by an order dated 4th March 2010 passed by the Central Information Commission. It appears that on a complaint filed by the Petitioner regarding tax evasion by one Pawan Kumar, the Income Tax Department commenced investigations. On 12th May 2009, the Petitioner sought information about the progress in the Tax Evasion Proceedings (TEP). By a letter dated 11th June 2009 the Petitioner was informed by the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO) of the Circle 47 (1), Income Tax Department that the details of the return of income/wealth filed by Pawan Kumar were in the nature of personal information of the concerned tax payer and confidential under Section 138 of the Income Tax Act, 1961. Further, the information was held by the tax authority as personal information and, therefore, could not be disclosed under Section 8 (1) (j) of the RTI Act. It was also pointed out that the Petitioner had matrimonial disputes with his wife and the said

Pawan Kumar was his father-in-law. The information was being sought by him in order to strengthen his position in the matrimonial dispute and, therefore, the disclosure would not be in public interest but was really concerning the private interest of the Petitioner.

2. After the Appellate Authority confirmed the order of the CPIO, the Petitioner approached the CIC. By the impugned decision of the CIC, the CPIO has been directed to disclose the broad outcome of the TEP to the applicant within four months time. It is, however, being clarified that the CPIO need not disclose the details of investigations.

3. Having heard the Petitioner, who appears in person, this Court is of the view that the impugned order does not call for any interference.

4. The petition is dismissed.

S. MURALIDHAR, J.

APRIL 07, 2010