

**CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Club building, Opposite Ber Sarai Market, Old JNU Campus, New Delhi- 110067.**

**Tel: 011 - 26182593/26182594**

**Email: registrycab@gmail.com**

**File No : CIC/BJ/A/2016/000017**

In the matter of:

Mr. S Ramakrishna Reddy  
H No 9/122 Kothapeta,  
Dhone (Town and Mandal)  
Kurnool, Distt A.P.

...Appellant

VS

Central Public Information Officer  
Sr. Divl. Commercial Manager,  
South Central Railway,  
Guntakal- 515801

Central Public Information Officer  
Sr. Divl. Personnel Manager  
Divisional Railway Manager's Office  
Guntakal Division, South Central Railway,  
Guntakal, Ananthapur, A.P.

...Respondents

	<b>Dates</b>
<b>RTI Application</b>	<b>: 18.10.2015</b>
<b>CPIO Reply</b>	<b>: 18.11.2015</b>
<b>First Appeal</b>	<b>: 08.12.2015</b>
<b>FAA's Order</b>	<b>: Not on record</b>
<b>Second Appeal</b>	<b>: 25.02.2016</b>
<b>Date of hearing</b>	<b>: 03.04.2017</b>

**Information sought:**

The appellant had sought copy of service record, merit list, memos, chargesheets, suspensions etc of Sh. N Ramachandra Rao and various other personal details.

**Grounds for Second Appeal**

The CPIO did not provide the desired information.

## **Order**

**Appellant** : **Absent**  
**Respondent** : **APIO, Shri Katrasen with other PIOs**

During the hearing the respondent CPIO submitted that they had provided the requisite reply vide their letter dated 18.11.2015 in connection with the RTI application dated 18.10.2015.

On perusal of the case record, it was seen that the reply dated 18.11.2015 is short on facts, legal knowledge and even on the point of perspective. The respondent APIO submitted that another reply dated 01.04.16 was provided to the appellant in reply to the stated RTI application. Since the same was not available in the case record, the respondent PIO was asked to read the same over the VC facility. He was intimated to send a copy of the same to the Commission through e-mail for record.

Though the section quoted by the CPIO in his reply to the appellant for denial is wrong, the purport of the letter is that information sought for belonged to a third party, hence the same could not be provided. After perusing, it was seen that it is indeed a third party information and cannot be provided. The information sought for related to house construction, purchase of scooter, details of income, etc. CPIO's interpretation was proper that there was no public interest angle involved in the disclosure of the said information. The information sought for is related to third party and is clearly exempted u/s 8(1) (j) of RTI Act.

Since the reply provided is just and proper and, moreover, the appellant was not there to contest his case. Hence, interference of the Commission is not called for in the matter.

***With the above observation, the appeal is disposed of.***

***Both the parties are to be provided copy of the order free of cost.***

**[Amitava Bhattacharyya]**  
**Information Commissioner**

Authenticated true copy

(A.K. Talapatra)  
Deputy Registrar