

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

Decision No. CIC/SB/A/2015/000132

Dated 10.10.2016

Appellant : Shri Aseem Takyar,
144, Phase-I,
Udyog Vihar, Gurgaon,
Haryana-122016.

Respondent : The Central Public Information Officer,
Delhi Police, O/o the FAA-cum-DCP,
Prov. & Logistics,
5, Rajpur Road,
Delhi-110054

Date of Hearing : 10.10.2016

Relevant dates emerging from the appeal:

RTI application filed on : 19.11.2014

CPIO's reply : 26.12.2014 (Not in file)

First appeal filed on : 21.01.2015

FAA's order : 20.03.2015

Second appeal filed on : 30.06.2015

ORDER

1. Shri Aseem Takyar filed an application dated 19.11.2014 under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) before the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO), O/o the Additional Commissioner of Police Delhi Police Headquarters seeking information on three points regarding Rubber Bullets, pistols and Guns, including (1) how many numbers and kind of each 'rubber bullets'. 'guns' and 'pistols' is in possession of Delhi Police

Department, (2) date on which each of these was purchased by the Delhi Police and (3) complete purchase cost involved in purchase of these.

2. The appellant filed a second appeal before the Commission on 30.06.2015 on the grounds that the CPIO did not reply to his RTI application within the stipulated period and the First Appellate Authority (FAA) denied the information under Section 8(1)(a) without stating as to how information is exempted when it is not classified nor does it compromise the security of the nation. The appellant requested the Commission to direct the CPIO to sever such information which is classified and provide the remaining information.

Hearing:

3. The appellant Shri Aseem Takyar was not present despite notice. The respondent Shri Subash Chander, Inspector, Delhi Police was present in person.

4. The respondent submitted that the appellant was informed vide letter dated 26.12.2014 that the information sought cannot be disclosed as the same would prejudicially affect the sovereignty and integrity of the nation. Hence, the disclosure of information sought is exempted under the provisions of Section 8(1) (a) of the RTI Act. The respondent further submitted that the FAA vide order dated 20.03.2015 had upheld the reply furnished by the CPIO.

Decision:

5. The Commission, after hearing the submissions of the respondent and perusing the records, finds no grounds to interfere with the order of the FAA dated 20.03.2015.

6. With the above observations the appeal is disposed of.

7. Copy of decision be given free of cost to the parties.

(Sudhir Bhargava)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(V.K. Sharma)
Designated Officer