



2026:DHC:8940



\$~43

\* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

% *Date of Decision: October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2026*

# CNR No. DLHC010400992025

+ W.P.(C) 9118/2025

SACHIN KUMAR DAKSH

.....Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person through  
V.C.

versus

DIRECTOR-ADMIN AND FINANCE &amp; ANR.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Varun Mishra, SPC-UIO  
with Ms. Shreeya Sud, Adv. for  
UIO.**CORAM:****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN****AMIT MAHAJAN, J. (Oral)**

1. The present petition has been filed seeking setting-aside of the Impugned Order dated 16.05.2025 passed by the learned Central Information Commission ("**Second Appellate Authority**"), whereby the second appeal filed by the Petitioner against the order passed by Public Information Officer of Directorate General of Civil Aviation ("**DGCA**"), was dismissed.

2. It is borne out from the record that the Petitioner had preferred an RTI Application dated 24.06.2024, seeking certain personal information with respect to a DGCA employee – Mr. Komal Prasad, which is reproduced as under: -

*"Under this RTI, I require following information of DGCA employee Mr. Kamal Prasad available under his service and office.*

*1. Details of LTC availed by DGCA employee Mr. Kamal Prasad*

Signature Not Verified

Signed By: HARMINDER  
KAUR  
Signing Date: 08.10.2026  
19:18:20

W.P.(C) 9118/2025

Page 1 of 5



2026:DHC:8940



*from 22.10.2016 to 26.10.2016 to Andaman and Nicobar form, LTC Settlement form, LTC tickets booked for each dependents and final LTC Settlement.*

*2. CGHS medical facility availed by dependents of Mr Kamal Prasad (all) since joining DGCA till date with medical bills amount to respective hospital/ clinic against each dependents separately.*

*3. Family declaration forms submitted by Kamal Prasad since joining DGCA against each dependents and annual dependents also to be required.*

*4. Any other LTC trip undertaken by Mr Kamal Prasad with dependents since joining DGCA till date with details Settlement form, LTC tickets booked for each dependents and. final LTC Settlement.”*

3. *Vide* Reply Letter dated 22.07.2024, the Central Public Information Officer (“**CPIO**”), DGCA informed the Petitioner that the information sought comes under the Rule 8 (j) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”) and the same cannot be disclosed.

4. Aggrieved, the Petitioner had preferred the first appeal against the above response. *Vide* Order dated 21.08.2024, the appeal was dismissed by the learned First Appellate Authority and it was noted that no infirmity is noticed in the Reply dated 22.07.2024 of the CPIO, DGCA.

5. Dissatisfied, the Second Appeal was filed before the learned Second Appellate Authority/CIC, which dismissed the same *vide* the Impugned Order dated 16.05.2025, holding that the information sought constituted third-party personal information exempt from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act and that no “*larger public interest*” warranting disclosure had been established by the Petitioner.

6. Now, the Petitioner has approached this Court and the sole contention of the Petitioner is that the information was sought details of LTC and CGHS medical benefits along with family declaration of



2026:DHC:8940



the concerned DGCA employee and that, since public funds were involved, the information ought to have been disclosed in larger public interest.

7. Significantly, the RTI Act seeks to promote transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities, however, the right to information is not an unqualified right. The legislature has consciously carved out Section 8 of the RTI Act which envisages exemption from disclosure of information and Sub-Section (1) clause (j) of the same provides that information which relates to personal information and the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest, or which would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the individual, is exempted from disclosure, unless the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer or the appellate authority, as the case may be, is satisfied that the *larger public interest* justifies the disclosure of such information.

8. In the present case, a perusal of the RTI application demonstrates that the Petitioner has sought, *inter alia*, details of LTC availed by the concerned employee with his dependents, the LTC tickets booked for each dependent, final settlement details, details of CGHS medical facilities availed by each dependent since the joining of the employee, medical bills pertaining to respective hospitals or clinics, family declaration forms submitted by the employee in respect of his dependents, and details of other LTC journeys undertaken with such dependents.

9. The information thus sought is not confined to an aggregate figure representing expenditure incurred by the DGCA on account of



2026:DHC:8940



LTC or medical reimbursement. It seeks information pertaining to identifiable family members and their travel, medical treatment, medical expenditure and the family declarations furnished by the employee in relation thereto. In the factual context of the present case, such information, by its very nature, concerns the private affairs of the concerned employee and more significantly, of his family members who are third parties and are not before this Court. The fact that some expenditure may have been reimbursed from public funds does not, by itself, result in the personal particulars connected with such expenditure ceasing to constitute personal information. Thus, it had been rightly held by the three competent authorities that the information sought relates to the personal affairs of third parties and is covered under the exemption stipulated in Section 8 (1)(j) of the RTI Act.

10. Additionally, merely stating that the benefits in question may have involved expenditure from public funds cannot not, by itself, render the underlying *personal information* liable to disclosure, that too when the Petitioner has not demonstrated any overriding larger public interest which would warrant disclosure of the personal information of the concerned employee and his family members.

11. Insofar as the contention of the Petitioner, that he is seeking the above information to pursue vigilance complaints, is concerned, the same cannot, by itself, create an independent right to access information which is otherwise exempted/protected.

12. Notably, it has also been pointed out by the learned Counsel for the Respondent that the Petitioner was married to the sister of Mr.



2026:DHC:8940



Komal Prasad and that matrimonial disputes have since arisen between the parties, with divorce proceedings having been initiated. It was thus submitted that the present RTI application has been filed with a pre-determined intent arising out of the personal dispute between the parties, and is not a *bona fide* attempt to seek information in any larger public interest.

13. In this backdrop, this Court is also mindful that the RTI mechanism cannot be permitted to become a means to settle personal scores or to pursue grievances arising out of matrimonial disputes, particularly when the information sought pertains to the personal affairs of a third party.

14. In view of the above, the present writ petition is dismissed.

15. Pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

**AMIT MAHAJAN, J**

**OCTOBER 7, 2026**

**“SK”**