

# 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/KY/C/2014/000197

Complainant : Shri Lakhan Lal Gupta  
S/o. Shri Durga Prasad Gupta  
R/o. 78A, Shreegopal Nagar, Gopalpara  
Bye Pass, Jaipur-302019

Public Authority : The CPIO  
Ministry of Urban Development  
Department of Publication  
Civil Lines, Delhi-110054

Date of Hearing : 16.09.2016

Date of Decision : 16.09.2016

## Presence:

Complainant : Absent  
CPIO : Shri G D Pandey, Asst. Controller & CPIO

## FACTS:

- I. Vide RTI application dated **NIL**, the Complainant sought information on **sole issue**.
- II. CPIO, vide its response dated **05.03.2013, 07.04.2014, 26.04.2013, 02.05.2014**, has provided the information to the Complainant.
- III. The First Appeal (FA) was filed on **11.03.2013**, (as per FAO) is not on record.
- IV. First Appellate Authority (FAA), vide its order dated **23.04.2013**, directed CPIO to provide the information.
- V. CIC Order dated **06.03.2014**, directed CPIO to provide the information to the Appellant.
- VI. Grounds for the Complaint filed on **02.06.2013**, 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 **06.03.2014**, passed by this Bench, in file No. **CIC/VS/A/2013/000938/KY**, disposed of then second appeal by directing the CPIO to provide the complete required information to then Appellant.

2. It is pertinent to mention here that non-compliance of Hon. CIC's earlier order dated **06.03.2014**, CPIO, vide his response dated **02.09.2014**, **13.10.2014** & **08.12.2014**, provided the complete required information to the complainant. In view of this, the Commission feels that present complaint filed under Section 18(1) of the RTI Act 2005, with prayer to award the penal action under Section 20(1) of the RTI Act 2005 does not sustain in the eyes of Law and deserves to be dismissed.
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 Urban Development  
Department of Publication  
Civil Lines, Delhi-110054

Shri Lakhan Lal Gupta  
S/o. Shri Durga Prasad Gupta  
R/o. 78A, Shreegopal Nagar, Gopalpara  
Bye Pass, Jaipur-302019