ITEM NO.24 COURT NO.12 SECTION IX

## SUPREME COURT OF INDIA RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 2783/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 11-11-2024 in WP No. 9648/2021 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Bombay]

PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER AND REGISTRAR & ANR. PETITIONER(S)

**VERSUS** 

ONKAR DATTATRAY KALMANKAR & ANR.

RESPONDENT(S)

(FOR ADMISSION and IA No. 27545/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

Date: 07-02-2025 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHANSHU DHULIA HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH

For Petitioner(s):

Mr. K. K. Venugopal, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Sandeep Sudhakar Deshmukh, AOR

Ms. Chinmayee, Adv.

Mr. Nishant Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Ankur S. Savadikar, Adv.

Mr. Viraj M. Parakh, Adv.

For Respondent(s):

Mr. Shantanu M. Adkar, Adv.

Mr. Rishabh Jain, Adv.

Mr. Bhushan, Adv.

Mr. Rajiv Shankar Dvivedi, AOR

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

Heard Mr. K. K. Venugopal, learned senior counsel for the petitioner.

We see absolutely no reason to interfere with the

impugned order passed by the High Court of Bombay, which has correctly interpreted the provisions of Section 8(1) (j) of the Right to Information Act 2005 (for short 'the RTI Act, 2005'). The issue relates to disclosure of marks of other candidate in an examination. We are also of the view that the disclosure of the marks though may fall in the category of personal information, yet the disclosure of this personal information is presently necessary in public interest, and therefore, it is not an information which cannot be given by the Information Officer under the RTI Act, 2005. To the contrary, such an information must be disclosed in order to maintain transparency in the process.

The special leave petition is, accordingly, dismissed in the above terms.

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

(POOJA SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(RENU BALA GAMBHIR)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR