

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

Appeal No. CIC/SA/A/2016/000101

Appellant: Mr. Budhakaran Yogi,
Nr. Power House, Post- Dundlog,
Jhunjhunu- 333702,
Rajasthan.

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer
Bar Council Of India, 21,
Rouse Avenue Institutional
Area, New Delhi- 110002

Date of Hearing: 10.07.2017

Dated of Decision: 10.07.2017

ORDER

Facts:

1. The appellant filed RTI application dated 24.08.2015 seeking information regarding Appeal No. 26/ 2009 (D.C. 01/ 2008) in following six points: (a) to specify number of applications (b) to specify the number of authentication (c) to specify the number of folios (d) when the decision will be given (e) why is the order on hold even after the completion of hearing (f) what was the date of the last hearing
2. The CPIO responded on 09.09.2015. The appellant filed First Appeal dated 25.09.2015 with First Appellate Authority (FAA). The FAA responded on 03.11.2015. The appellant filed second appeal on 29.12.2015 before the Commission on the ground that information should be provided to him.
3. The Commission vide its order dated on 28.12.2016, directed the CPIO of BCI to show cause as to why maximum penalty should not be imposed on them for demanding exorbitant amount to give copy of the complaint and also directed the respondent authority to provide the certified copy of the entire D.C. 26/ 2009 pertaining to appellant's complaint, charging the fees in accordance with the RTI Rules.

Hearing:

4. The respondent was present in the hearing in person. The appellant participated in the hearing through VC.

5. The appellant stated that the sought for information has been received by him but only seal was affixed and the word 'attested' was not written on the document provided to him.

6. The respondent stated that the matter at hand has already been heard and disposed of by this Commission on 28.12.2016. The respondent stated that all information has been provided to the appellant. The respondent stated that the show cause was issued to them only for demanding exorbitant amount to give copy of the documents. The respondent stated that they have subsequently demanded copying charges as per their extant rules and the appellant has been provided copy of the sought documents. The respondent stated that they have affixed official seal and signed on each and every page of the documents. The respondent stated that they have filed written submission dated 03.07.2017, which may be taken on record.

Discussion/ observation:

7. The sought information has been received by the appellant. The Commission observed that the official seal and signature is enough for certifying the documents.

Decision:

8. The show cause is dropped. 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