

**Central Information Commission, New Delhi**  
**File No.CIC/WB/A/2010/000320 & 321-SM**  
**Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (19)**

**Date of hearing** : **3 August 2011**

**Date of decision** : **3 August 2011**

**Name of the Appellant** : **Commodore Lokesh K. Batra (Retd),  
Social & RTI Activist,  
H-02, Sector 25, Jalvayu Vihar,  
Noida – 201 301 (U.P.)**

**Name of the Public Authority** : **CPIO, Supreme Court of India,  
New Delhi.**

The Appellant was represented by Shri Venkatesh Nayak, Shri S.C. Agarwal and Shri Pranav Sachdeva.

On behalf of the Respondent, the following were present:-

- (i) Ms. Smita Vats Sharma, CPIO
- (ii) Shri Arijit Prasad, Advocate

**Chief Information Commissioner** : **Shri Satyananda Mishra**

2. Both the parties were present during the hearing. We heard their submissions. In two separate RTI-applications, the Appellant had sought details about those cases which had been pending with the Supreme Court in which the arguments had already been heard but the orders had been reserved. This information had been sought for the period beginning 2007 to 2009. The CPIO had not provided the information on the ground that it was not available in this form. The Appellate Authority had endorsed this response.

3. During the hearing, on behalf of the Appellant, it was submitted that the website of the Supreme Court did not contain such information and, therefore, the Appellant wanted to know the statistical details about such cases. In response, the Respondents argued that the Supreme Court ordinarily passed orders within 2-4 weeks of reserving the orders and about those few rare cases in which orders were not passed for a longer period, no specific data was being maintained. It was further submitted that to compile the number of such cases, each individual case file would have to be scrutinised, a nearly impossible task given the volume of cases pending in the Supreme Court. On behalf of the Appellant, it was argued that if the Supreme Court had not been maintaining such information in the past, it was time that it should do so in order to enlighten the citizens about the status of cases pending before the Supreme Court.

4. After carefully considering the facts of the cases and the submissions made as above, we are of the view that the total number of such cases in which orders are reserved should be duly intimated to the general public. Now that the benefit of computerization is available, placing such data in the public domain should not be particularly difficult. Therefore, if the Supreme Court is not maintaining such data, it should do so now in order to facilitate the citizens to learn about the status of pendency before the Supreme Court. We direct the CPIO to provide to the Appellant within 15 working days from the receipt of this order the desired information, if available centrally, and, not available centrally, to bring it to the notice of the competent authority in the Supreme Court to ensure that necessary arrangements are made in future for compiling such information and disclosing it in the public domain.

5. The appeals are disposed off accordingly.

6. Copies of this order be given free of cost to the parties.

**(Satyananda Mishra)**  
**Chief Information Commissioner**

Authenticated true copy. Additional copies of orders shall be supplied against application and payment of the charges prescribed under the Act to the CPIO of this Commission.

**(Vijay Bhalla)**  
**Deputy Registrar**