

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
2nd Floor, 'B' Wing, August Kranti Bhawan,
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi -110066
Tel : +91-11-26186535

Appeal No. CIC/BS/A/2016/001762

Appellant: Mr. Ram Prakash Pandey,
S/O. Late SH. N=Manmohan Lal
Pandey, Telecom Centre
Kamlapur, Sitapur,
(9453220050).

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer
TDM BSNL,
O/o. Telecom Distt. Manager,
Sitapur.

Date of Hearing: 17.07.2017

Dated of Decision: 17.07.2017

ORDER

Facts:

1. The appellant filed RTI application dated 19.01.2016 seeking information on 3 points : quantum of OFC cables laid in Sitapur SSA during 2012 to 2015; how many OFC cables run on route NTR of Sitapur SSA; how much amount has been recovered on disconnection of OFC cable from companies/firms who were responsible for damage to OFC cables.
2. The CPIO responded on 20.02.2016 and did not provided requested information. The appellant filed First Appeal dated 04.03.2016 with First Appellate Authority (FAA). The FAA responded on 08.04.16. The appellant filed second appeal on 04.06.2016 before the Commission on the ground that information has not been provided to him.

Hearing:

3. The appellant and respondent Shri Ravi Anand (DE, Sitapur) participated in the hearing through video conferencing.

4. The appellant stated that he is not satisfied with the reply of the respondent. The appellant stated that the sought for information has not been provided to him. The appellant stated that the OFC is damaged repeatedly as it had not been laid up to the standard depth. The appellant stated that his telephones are not working properly because of frequent disconnection/damage of OFC. The appellant stated that he wants information more particularly on point no. 2 of his RTI application. The appellant alleged that the contractor has not laid the OFC with the standard norms and yet payment has been made to him.

5. The respondent stated that they cannot share with the appellant the information related to their services and assets. The respondent stated that the disclosure of the information would adversely impact their competitive position vis-a-vis the private entities. On query from the Commission, the respondent could not explain how the disclosure of information would hurt their competitive position.

Discussion/ observation:

6. The disclosure of information is not seen to hurt the competitive position of respondent. The sought for information should be provided to the appellant.

Decision:

7. The respondent is directed to provide information to appellant, free of cost, within 30 days of receipt of this order.

The appeal is disposed of. Copy of the order be given to the parties free of cost.

(Radha Krishna Mathur)
Chief Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(S.C. Sharma)
Dy. Registrar