

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
2nd Floor, 'B' Wing, August Kranti Bhavan,
Bhikaji Cama Place, NEW DELHI-110 066
TEL: 011-26717355

Appeal No. CIC/RM/A/2014/004300

Appellant: Shri Rameshwar Sharma,
R/o C-343, Gali No.16,
Bhajanpura, Delhi - 110053.

Respondent: Central Public Information
Officer/Additional Registrar, Supreme
Court of India, Tilak Marg , New Delhi

Date of Hearing: 06.09.2016

Date of Decision: 06.09.2016

ORDER

Facts:

1. The appellant filed RTI application on 06.05.2013 seeking information on 18 points regarding action taken by the Chief Minister Haryana on complaints dated 11.12.2011 and 2012 received against the officers from Sonipat District with regard to the security expenses incurred on President of India, Prime Minister of India, Chief Minister of India, and various other issues.
2. The appellant filed first appeal with the First Appellate Authority (FAA) on 27.12.2013. The CPIO and FAA response is not available on record. The appellant filed second appeal before the Commission on 17.06.2014 with a plea that the sought for information has not been provided to him.

Hearing:

3. The appellant did not participate in the hearing. The respondent participated in the hearing along with the Advocate Shri Harshvardhan Singh.
4. Respondent stated that the appellant vide letter dated 05.06.2013 was informed that the information sought for by the appellant is not maintained in the Supreme Court of India. Further he was informed that the official language

of the Supreme Court of India is English and he may refer to the Article 348 of the Constitution and Supreme Court Rules 1966, which are available on the website, in this regard.

5. The respondent stated that the sought for information is not covered under section 2(f) of the RTI Act and it is beyond the jurisdiction and scope of the duties of the CPIO, Supreme Court of India under the Right to Information Act, 2005 to interpret the law, judgments/orders, to take action against the authority or to direct the authority to take action, to give explanation, opine, comment or advise on matters.

6. The respondent stated that the first appellate authority vide its order dated 24.02.2014 had disposed of the first appeal having concurred with the findings of the CPIO.

Discussion/observations:

7. The action/steps taken by the respondent in dealing with RTI application are satisfactory.

Decision:

8. No intervention of the Commission is required in the matter

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

(Radha Krishna Mathur)
Chief Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(S.C. Sharma)
Dy. Registrar

