

**CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION**

2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, August Kranti Bhawan,  
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066

**Decision No. CIC/SB/C/2015/000038, dated 22.09.2017**

**Shri Bishnu Kant Thakur v. The Central Public Information Officer  
(CPIO), Ministry of Home Affairs**

Relevant dates emerging from the Complaint:

|                        |                       |                              |
|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>RTI:</b> 08.06.2015 | <b>FA:</b> 30.07.2015 | <b>Complaint:</b> 05.09.2015 |
| <b>CPIO:</b> No reply  | <b>FAAO:</b> No Order | <b>Hearing:</b> 22.09.2017   |

**ORDER**

1. The complainant filed an online application under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) before the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO), Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA), seeking an attested copy of the detailed action taken report in respect of the action taken by the MHA on his public grievance with the registration number MINHA/E/2015/01524.

2. The complainant filed a complaint before the Commission on the grounds that no reply, in response to his RTI application, was provided by the CPIO, MHA. The complainant is also aggrieved with the non-disposal of his first appeal by the First Appellate Authority (FAA), MHA. The complainant requested the Commission to direct the CPIO, MHA, to provide the information sought for by him and to take action against the errant CPIO under Section 20 of the RTI Act.

**Hearing:**

3. The complainant was not present despite notice. The respondent Shri L.C. Trehan, Section Officer, MHA was present in person.

4. The respondent submitted that the complainant was informed vide letter dated 27.06.2016 that the information sought for had already been

provided to him vide letters dated 10.02.2015, 22.04.2015, 03.06.2015, 18.06.2015 and 23.06.2015. The complainant was also asked to deposit Rs. 10/- as photocopying charges for obtaining the requisite documents. However, no communication was received from the complainant. Hence, the documents sought could not be provided to the complainant.

**Decision:**

5. The Commission, after hearing the submissions of the respondent and perusing the records, observes that a reply in response to the RTI application had been provided to the complainant asking him to deposit prescribed fees for obtaining the requisite documents. However, the complainant chose not to obtain copies of the same. Hence, no further intervention of the Commission is required in the matter.
6. With the above observations, the complaint is disposed of.
7. Copy of the decision be provided free of cost to the parties.

**(Sudhir Bhargava)**  
**Information Commissioner**

**Authenticated true copy**

**(S.S. Rohilla)**  
**Designated Officer**

Addresses of the parties:

1. The Central Public Information Officer (CPIO),  
Ministry of Home Affairs,  
North Block, New Delhi-110 001.
2. Shri Bishnu Kant Thakur,