

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/2016/000165

Appellant: D. Kumar
13, Ganapathy MAA Nagar, Coimbatore-641006,
TN.

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer
Sr. Supdt., Deptt. Of Posts, O/o Sr. Supdt. Of Post
Offices, Coimbtore Divn., Coimbatore-641001, TN.

Date of Hearing: 10.04.2017
Dated of Decision: 10.04.2017

ORDER

Facts:

1. The appellant filed RTI application dated 09.04.2015 seeking copy of delivery slip dated 7, 8, 9-8-2013 of Coimbatore-36 post office.
2. The CPIO responded on 07.05.2015. The appellant filed first appeal dated 09.05.2015 with First Appellate Authority (FAA). The FAA responded on 17.06.2015. The appellant filed second appeal on 13.08.2015 before the Commission on the ground that information should be provided to him.

Hearing:

3. The appellant and the respondent participated in the hearing through VC.
4. The appellant stated that the reply given by the CPIO and the first appellate authority is not correct. The appellant stated that the Delivery Slip is a public document and in the larger public interest it should be provided to him. The appellant stated that it is correct that he is not addressee of the posted article. On query from the Commission, the appellant explain the larger public interest viz that the sought for Delivery Slip is linked with his personal criminal case, for which information has been sought which is pending in the Court.

5. The respondent stated that the appellant is not the addressee of any of the posted articles as per their available record. The respondent stated that the department has a fiduciary relationship with the sender and the addressee of an article booked under Department of Posts. The respondent stated that the sought for information is third party information thus it cannot be provided under section 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act. The respondent further stated that the record retention period for such record is 1 ½ year. The record has since been weeded out.

Discussion/ observation:

6. The sought for information pertains to third party and no larger public interest is involved in the matter. The action/steps taken by the respondent in dealing with the RTI application are satisfactory.

Decision:

7. The Commission's intervention is not required in the matter.

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