

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

2nd Floor, August Kranti Bhawan,
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066

Decision No. CIC/YA/A/2014/000131/SB

Dated 08.09.2016

Appellant : Smt. Shashi Pandey,
1901, Gaud Vaishvik Gram,
Chatuspath Gantantra, Ghaziabad,
U.P.-201 016.

Respondent : Central Public Information Officer,
Central Information Commission,
2nd Floor, B-Wing, August Kranti Bhawan,
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110001.

Date of Hearing : 05.09.2016

Relevant dates emerging from the appeal:

RTI application filed on : 27.04.2013

CPIO's reply : 31.05.2013

First appeal filed on : 16.06.2013

FAA's order : 25.07.2013

Second appeal filed on : 20.11.2013

ORDER

1. Smt. Shashi Pandey filed an application dated 27.04.2013 under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) before the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO), Central Information Commission (CIC) seeking information

pertaining to action taken on her four letters relating to non-compliance of the Commission's Decision No. CIC/AD/C/2012/000641 dated 01.08.2012.

2. The appellant filed a second appeal dated 12.08.2014 before the Commission on the grounds that she has been provided incomplete information.

3. The appellant Ms. Shashi Pandey was not present despite notice. The respondent Shri S.P. Beck, Joint Secretary (Admin and RTI), CIC and Shri R.L. Gupta, Dy. Registrar to IC(BS) were present in person.

4. The respondent submitted that the issue raised in the RTI application relates to an order no. CIC/AD/C/2012/000641 dated 01.08.2012 passed by the Commission, whereby, the complaint of the appellant was remanded to the CPIO, Railway Board. The respondent further submitted that the appellant/complainant was directed to file first appeal before the FAA, Railway Board and thereafter a second appeal, if necessary, may be filed before the Commission. However, it is not clear from the documents submitted by the appellant as to whether the directions of the Commission were complied with. In the absence of the File No. of the relevant file of the Commission, if any, it is not possible to comment upon the issues now being raised in the appeal. The respondent also stated that a point wise reply dated 31.05.2013 was provided to the appellant in response to his RTI application dated 27.04.2013. Also the directions of the FAA's order dated 25.07.2013 were duly complied with vide letter dated 30.07.2013. Hence, no further action on the part of the respondent is necessary in this matter.

Decision:

5. The Commission, after hearing the respondent and perusing the records, observes that a point wise reply has already been provided to the appellant vide letters dated 31.05.2015 and 30.07.2013. However, the same could not be

verified due to the absence of the appellant during the hearing. In case the appellant is not satisfied with the information provided, she may file a complaint with the Commission.

6. With the above observations, the appeal is disposed of.
7. Copy of the decision be provided to both the parties free of cost.

(Sudhir Bhargava)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(V.K. Sharma)
Designated Officer