

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

Complaint No.CIC/BS/C/2015/000068

Complainant: Manoj Kumar
S/o Late Sh. Ishwar Singh,
Vill./PO- Daulatpur, New Delhi-110043

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer
Astt. Dir. (Rectt.), Deptt. of Posts, O/o Chief
Postmaster General of Post Offices, Delhi Circle,
New Delhi-110001

Date of Hearing: 23.03.2017
Date of Decision: 23.03.2017

ORDER

Facts:

1. The complainant filed RTI application dated 17.06.2014 seeking information on 4 points regarding constitution of Committee(s) for recommendation of compassionate appointments in PA cadre, after February, 2005, copy of details of decisions taken by the Committee etc.
2. The CPIO response is not on record. The appellant filed first appeal with the first appellate authority. The First Appellate Authority responded on 03.09.2014. The complainant filed a complaint with the Commission on 23.02.2015 with a plea to impose penalty upon the CPIO.

Hearing:

3. The appellant and the respondent participated in the hearing personally.
4. The appellant stated that the respondent had not replied to his RTI application dated 17.06.2014. The appellant stated that there were 19 case of compassionate appointment and 2 cases have been recommended out of 19.

The appellant stated that he wants to know that whether remaining 17 cases were put up before the Committee and why his case had not been considered.

5. The respondent stated that the appellant's RTI application dated 17.06.2014 had not been received by the CPIO. The respondent stated that the appellant filed first appeal on 25.07.2014. The respondent stated that the first appellate authority had disposed the appeal vide order dated 03.09.2014. The respondent stated that in compliance of the first appellate authority order, they have replied to the appellant vide letter dated 17.03.2017.

6. The respondent stated that as per their understanding, the appellant case was first re-examined for a decision as per the first appellate authority order. Therefore, they have replied to after putting the case before the Committee and getting their decision. The respondent stated that the appellant's case was rejected by the Committee.

Discussion/ observation:

7. On perusal of the reply given by the respondent, it is found that the reply is not adequate. The complainant has filed first appeal and is still pursuing for information, thus, the complaint can be treated as appeal.

Decision:

8. The respondent is directed to give adequate pointwise reply to the appellant, within 7 days 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