

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

Room No. – 308, 2nd Floor, August Kranti Bhawan,
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi – 110066.
Website: cic.gov.in

File No. CIC/CC/C/2015/000003/KY

Complainant : Shri Tapan Kumar Rakshit
Advocate,
Village-Shimchak, P.O-Dhurkhali
District- Howrah, West Bengal-711410

Public Authority : The CPIO
M/o Consumer Affairs
Food Corporation of India
HQ 16-20, Barakhamba Lane
New Delhi-110001

Date of Hearing : 29.08.2016

Date of Decision : 29.08.2016

Presence:

Complainant : Absent
CPIO : Shri S Brajesh, AGM & ACPIO

FACTS:

- I. Vide RTI application dated **09.10.2013**, the appellant sought information on **12 issues**.
- II. CPIO, vide its response dated **09.12.2013**, denied the information u/s 8 (1) (j).
- III. The First Appeal (FA) was filed on **07.01.2014**, as desired information not provided.
- IV. First Appellate Authority (FAA), vide its order dated **04.02.2014**, requested Applicant to show the public interest against the Information.
- V. Grounds for the Complaint filed on **23.12.2014**, are contained in the Memorandum of Complaint.

HEARING

Complainant opted to be absent despite of our due notice to him. Respondents appeared before the Commission personally and made the submissions at length.

DECISION

It is pertinent to mention here that the complainant, vide his RTI Application dated **09.10.2013**, has sought information from the respondents on **12 issues**. Respondents vide their response dated **09.12.2013**, denied the required information to the complainant by taking a plea under Section 8(1) (j) of the RTI Act 2005. Being aggrieved by the aforesaid response, FA was filed by the complainant on **07.01.2014** before the FAA, who

vide his order dated **04.02.2014**, upheld the decision of CPIO. Hence, complainant has filed his complaint dated **23.12.2014** before the Commission.

2. Apart from above, it is to be seen here that despite of our **due notice**, Complainant failed to appear **either in person** or through someone, duly authorized by him before the Commission to press his case. However, the Commission feels that complainant must have appeared, in such situations, to press his complaint before the Commission, after all, it is his case to be pursued specifically but complainant is absent **deliberately**, despite of our due notice. Thus, it shows the intention of the complainant that he is not interested, **at all**, in pursuing his own case before the Commission.
3. In view of the above, the Commission feels that **no fruitful purpose** would be served by proceeding **in such cases**. Thus, the Commission is of the considered view that it would be **appropriate and even justified to dismiss** the case. Therefore, it is hereby **dismissed**.

The complaint is dismissed accordingly.

Sd/-
(M.A. Khan Yusufi)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(Krishan Avtar Talwar)
Deputy Secretary

The CPIO
M/o Consumer Affairs
Food Corporation of India
HQ 16-20, Barakhamba Lane
New Delhi-110001

Shri Tapan Kumar Rakshit
Advocate,
Village-Shimchak, P.O-Dhurkhali
District- Howrah, West Bengal-711410