

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

Appeal No. CIC/BS/A/2016/000092

CIC/BS/A/2016/000289

Appellant: Tejinder Singh
H.No. S-5/5, Garden Colony, Mission Road,
Pathankot-145001 Punjab.

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer
Dir-I Deptt. of Telecomm., Telecom Enforcement ,
Resource & Monitoring Cell (PB), 1st Floor,
Telephone Exchange Building, Sec-70, Mohali
Chandigarh-160071.

Date of Hearing: 26.05.2017
Dated of Decision: 26.05.2017

ORDER

Facts:

1. The appellant filed RTI applications dated 16.09.2015, 02.07.2015 seeking information 3 points regarding action taken on his complaint dated 28.05.2015, name & designation of handling officer of the complaint etc.
2. The CPIO responded on 09.11.2015, 14.09.2015 by giving pointwise reply. The appellant filed first appeal on 15.11.2015, 21.09.2015 with First Appellate Authority (FAA). The FAA responded on 07.12.2015, 14.10.2015 and upheld the decision of CPIO. The appellant filed second appeal before the Commission on 05.01.2016 on the ground that information should be provided to him.

Hearing:

3. The appellant did not participate in the hearing. The respondent Shri Sushil Kumar (Director, TERM) participated in the hearing through VC.

4. The respondent stated that the pointwise information has been given to the appellant vide letter dated 09.11.2015 and 14.09.2015. The respondent stated that the appellant's complaint has already been disposed of. The respondent stated that the name, designation, and email address of officers, who had handled the appellant's complaint, have been informed to the appellant. The respondent stated that if the telecom service provider does not comply with the documents requirement, he can be penalised. The respondent stated that there is no provision for payment of compensation to the complainant. The respondent stated that the license cancellation of telecom service provider is not in their jurisdiction.

Discussion/ observation:

5. The sought for information has been provided to the appellant. The steps/action taken by the respondent in dealing with the RTI application is satisfactory.

Decision:

6. No intervention is required in the matter at the level of this Commission.

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