

# CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

Room No. – 308, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, August Kranti Bhawan,  
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi – 110066.  
Website: cic.gov.in

File No. CIC/CC/C/2014/000170/KY

Complainant : Shri Rajesh Budhalal Mehta  
3, Suvidha Apartments, Nr. NutanNagrik Bank  
Sarkhej Road, Vasna, Ahmedabad, Gujarat

Public Authority : The CPIO  
Ministry of Commerce and Industry  
The State Trading Corporation of India Limited,  
6th Floor, H K House, Ashram Road, Ahmedabad-380009, Gujarat

Date of Hearing : 16.09.2016  
Date of Decision : 16.09.2016

## Presence:

Complainant : Absent  
CPIO : Shri Sanjay Kumar, BM & CPIO

## FACTS:

- I. Vide RTI application dated **16.08.2012**, the Complainant sought information on **9 issues**.
- II. CPIO, vide its response dated **11.09.2012**, denied to provided the information u/s 8 (1) (d, h & j)
- III. The First Appeal (FA) was filed on **04.10.2012**, as desired information not provided.
- IV. First Appellate Authority (FAA), vide its order dated **14.11.2012**, upheld the decision of CPIO.
- V. CIC Vide its Order dated **22.10.2013**, and **16.12.2013**, directed respondent to provide the information.
- VI. Grounds for the Complaint filed on **18.09.2014**, are contained in the Memorandum of Complaint.

## HEARING

**Complainant opted to be absent despite of our due notice to him.** Respondents appeared before the Commission personally and made the submissions at length.

## DECISION

At the outset, it is stated here that Hon. CIC vide its earlier order dated **16.12.2013**, passed by Madam Sushma Singh, Hon. Information Commissioner, in file No.

**CIC/SS/A/2013/000732**, disposed of then second appeal by directing the CPIO to provide the required information to then Appellant.

2. It is pertinent to mention here that in compliance of Hon. CIC's earlier order dated **16.12.2013**, APIO, vide his response dated **10.01.2014**, provided the required information, running into 28 pages, to the appellant.
3. Apart from above, it is to be seen here that despite of our **due notice**, Complainant failed to appear **either in person** or through someone, duly authorized by him before the Commission to press his case. However, the Commission feels that complainant must have appeared, in such situations, to press his complaint before the Commission, after all, it is his case to be pursued specifically but complainant is absent **deliberately**, despite of our due notice. Thus, it shows the intention of the complainant that he is not interested, **at all**, in pursuing his own case before the Commission.
4. In view of the above, the Commission feels that **no fruitful purpose** would be served by proceeding **in such cases**. Thus, the Commission is of the considered view that it would be **appropriate and even justified** to **dismiss** the case. Therefore, it is hereby **dismissed**.

The complaint is dismissed accordingly.

Sd/-  
(M.A. Khan Yusufi)  
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(Krishan Avtar Talwar)  
Deputy Secretary

The CPIO  
Ministry of Commerce and Industry  
The State Trading Corporation of India Limited,  
6th Floor, H K House, Ashram Road,  
Ahmedabad-380009, Gujarat

Shri Rajesh Budhalal Mehta  
3, Suvidha Apartments, Nr. NutanNagrik Bank  
Sarkhej Road, Vasna, Ahmedabad, Gujarat