

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
INHERENT JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION (CIVIL) Diary No(s). 36812/2024

in

WRIT PETITION (C) NO. 1040 OF 2019

ANUJ NAKADE

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

DR. POONAM MALAKONDAIAH
GOVT. OF ANDHRA PRADESH & ORS.

Respondent(s)

WITH

CONTEMPT PETITION (C) DIARY NO. 6902/2025

IN

WRIT PETITION (C) NO. 1040 OF 2019

O R D E R

1. The present contempt petitions are filed for alleged non-compliance of orders passed by this Court on 20.03.2023.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has also brought to our notice the recent decision of this Court in "*Kishan Chand Jain Vs. Union of India & Ors.*" reported in [2023] 11 SCR 198, which recognizes the statutory regime and obligates the duty bearers to implement the provisions of the Act.
3. The said Judgment takes note of the relevant provisions of the Right to Information Act. The relevant portion of the Judgment is quoted as under :-

"25. Having examined the Right to Information established by the statute under Section 3 in the context of the obligations of public authorities under Section 4, we are of the opinion that the purpose and object of the statute will be accomplished only if the principle of accountability governs the relationship between 'right holders' and 'duty bearers'. The Central and State Information Commissions have a prominent place, having a statutory recognition under Chapters III and IV of the Act and their power and functions all enumerated in detail in Section 18 of the Act. We have also noted the special power of 'Monitoring and Reporting' conferred on the Central and State Information Commissioners which must be exercised keeping in mind the purpose and object of the Act, i.e., 'to promote transparency and accountability in working of every public authority'.

26. For the reasons stated above, we

direct that the Central Information Commission and the State Information Commissions shall continuously monitor the implementation of the mandate of Section 4 of the Act as also prescribed by the Department of Personnel and Training in its Guidelines and Memorandums issued from time to time. The directions will also include instructions under O.M. dated 07.11.2019 issued by the Department. For this purpose, the Commissioners will also be entitled to issue recommendations under sub-Section (5) of Section 25 to public authorities for taking necessary steps for complying with the provisions of the Act."

4. In view of above, the contempt petitions are closed, directing the authorities concerned to take action for implementation of the statutory regime.

5. Pending interlocutory application(s), if any, is/are disposed of.

.....J.
[PAMIDIGHANTAM SRI NARASIMHA]

.....J.
[ALOK ARADHE]

NEW DELHI;
FEBRUARY 20, 2026.

ITEM NO.45

COURT NO.5

SECTION PIL-W

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

CONTEMPT PETITION (CIVIL) Diary No(s). 36812/2024 in W.P.(C) No. 1040/2019

ANUJ NAKADE

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

DR. POONAM MALAKONDAIAH
GOVT. OF ANDHRA PRADESH & ORS.

Respondent(s)

WITH

Diary No(s). 6902/2025 (PIL-W)

Date : 20-02-2026 These petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PAMIDIGHANTAM SRI NARASIMHA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK ARADHE

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. N. Sai Vinod, AOR
Mr. Madhav Aggarwal, Adv.
Ms. Kanu Garg, Adv.

Petitioner-in-person

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Guntur Pramod Kumar, AOR
Ms. Prerna Singh, Adv.
Mr. Dhruv Yadav, Adv.

Mr. Balaji Subramaniam Aag, Adv.
Ms. G. Indira, AOR
Mr. P Gandepan, Adv.
Mr. Anurag Kashyap, Adv.
Ms. Yashi Jain, Adv.
Ms. Anjali Singh, Adv.
Ms. Raniba Pangnila, Adv.
Mr. Akash Kundu, Adv.

Mr. Rajiv Singh, A.A.G.
Mr. Mangaljit Mukherjee, Adv.
Mr. Anando Mukherjee, AOR
Mr. Dev Aaryan, Adv.

Mr. Lenin Singh Hijam, Advocate General
Mr. Pukhrambam Ramesh Kumar, AOR
Mr. Karun Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Anupama Ngangom, Adv.

Ms. Rajkumari Divyasana, Adv.

Ms. K. Enatoli Sema, AOR
Mr. Amit Kumar Singh, Adv.
Ms. Chubalemla Chang, Adv.
Mr. Prang Newmai, Adv.
Ms. Yanmi Phazang, Adv.

Mr. Sameer Abhyankar, AOR
Mr. Rahul Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Aakash Thakur, Adv.

Mr. Kunal Mimani, AOR
Mr. Prashant Arai, Adv.
Mr. Abhinav Rana, Adv.

Mr. Krishna Kant Dubey, Adv.
Mr. Mukesh Kumar Verma, Adv.
Mr. Yogesh Vats, Adv.
Mr. Shreekant Neelappa Terdal, AOR

Ms. Manisha T. Karia, AAG
Mr. Deepin Deepak Sahni, Adv.
Mr. Varun Khetwani, Adv.
Ms. Ananya Arora, Adv.
Ms. Shreya Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Vishal Navale, Adv.

Ms. Eliza Barr, Adv.
Ms. Disha Singh, AOR

Mr. Samir Ali Khan, AOR
Mr. Pranjal Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Kashif Irshad Khan, Adv.

Mr. Abhay Anil Anturkar, Adv.
Mr. Dhruv Tank, Adv.
Ms. Surbhi Kapoor, AOR
Mr. Sarthak Mehrotra, Adv.
Mr. Bhagwant Deshpande, Adv.
Ms. Subhi Pastor, Adv.
Mr. Uday Gautam, Adv.

Dr. Monika Gusain, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Akshay Amritanshu, AOR
Mr. Abhay Nair, Adv.
Mr. Sarthak Srivastava, Adv.
Mr. Mayur Goyal, Adv.

Mr. Ketan Paul, AOR
Ms. Gunita Tandon, Adv.
Ms. Ujala Singh, Adv.
Mr. Prachet Sharma, Adv.

Mr. D. L. Chidananda, AOR

Mr. Nishe Rajen Shonker, AOR
Mrs. Anu K Joy, Adv.
Mr. Alim Anvar, Adv.
Mr. Santhosh K, Adv.
Mrs. Devika A.l., Adv.

Ms. Manisha T. Karia, A.A.G.
Mr. Harmeet Singh Ruprah, AOR

Mr. Avijit Mani Tripathi, AOR
Mr. Upendra Mishra, Adv.
Mr. P. S. Negi, Adv.
Mr. T.k. Nayak, Adv.
Ms. Marbiang Khongwir, Adv.
Mr. Vikas Bansal, Adv.

Ms. Bharti Tyagi, AOR
Ms. Vishakha Raghuram, Adv.
Mr. Vikash Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Rajat Bhardwaj, A.A.G.
Mr. Siddhant Sharma, AOR

Mr. Saurabh Rajpal, AOR
Mr. Vinay Kumar Singh, Adv.
Mr. Ashzad Mubarak, Adv.

Ms. Devina Sehgal, AOR
Mr. Yatharth Kansal, Adv.

Mr. Akshat Kumar, AOR
Ms. Anubha Dhulia, Adv.

Ms. Swati Ghildiyal, AOR
Ms. Deepanwita Priyanka, Adv.
Ms. Sonakshi Sinha, Adv.

Mr. Aravindh S., AOR
Ms. Anika Bansal, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. The contempt petitions are closed in terms of the signed order.
2. Pending interlocutory application(s), if any, is/are disposed of.

(JAYANT KUMAR ARORA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(NIDHI WASON)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

(Signed order is placed on the file)