

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION  
2<sup>nd</sup> 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/2015/000134

Complainant: R V Radhakrishnan Nair  
Head Constable, O/o the inspector, RPF,  
Trivandrum, Central Rly Station, Trivandrum,  
Kerala.

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer  
Dy. GM (NOW-CM) M/o Comm. & IT, Deptt. of  
Telecommunication, BSNL, O/o the Sr. General  
Manager (NOW-CM), Mobile Service, RTTC  
Complex, Kaimanam, Thiruvananthapuram-40.

Date of Hearing: 22.03.2017  
Date of Decision: 22.03.2017

**ORDER**

**Facts:**

1. The complainant filed RTI application dated 24.02.2015 seeking information regarding: whether anyone has sought access to call details of his mobile no. 9497488499 during 14.08.2014 to 16.08.2014 etc.
2. The CPIO responded on 26.02.2015. The complainant filed the First Appeal on 28.02.2015. The First Appellate Authority responded on 16.03.2015. The complainant filed a complaint with the Commission on 12.05.2015 with a plea to impose penalty upon the CPIO.

**Hearing:**

3. The complainant and the respondent participated in the hearing through VC.
4. The complainant stated that he wants to know whether any request was made to respondent for giving the CDR of his mobile during the 14.08.2014 to 16.08.2014. The complainant stated that he has not been given complete information.
5. The respondent stated that the complainant has been replied to vide letter dated 26.02.2015 and 16.03.2015. The respondent stated that the complainant has been informed that no unauthorized person have accessed the CDR (Call Detail Record) of mobile no. 9497488499 for the period during the 14.08.2014 to 16.08.2014 as mentioned in the RTI application.
6. The complainant stated that that the respondent vide letter dated 14.07.2015 had further informed him that the information sought by him cannot be provided under section 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act. The complainant stated that the respondent did not inform him under what circumstances the respondent has not provided the information.
7. The respondent stated that they had given correct information on the date of reply. However, they shall recheck the record whether any request was subsequently received for the CDR. The respondent stated that they will review the case and share the information whatever possible.
8. The complainant stated that the RPF was using the CDR in an enquiry proceeding against him. He stated that the question is how did RPF get the CDR, while respondent has informed him that they did not receive any request for issue of CDR. This inconsistency needs to be reconciled.

**Discussion/ observation:**

9. The action taken by the respondent is satisfactory. However, the respondent shall check the records and re-confirm to the complainant whether any request for CDR was received, treating this as second appeal.
10. No laxity or case of malafide has been made out.

**Decision:**

11. The respondent is directed to take action as stated in para 11 above within 15 days of this order.

The complaint 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