

# 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/2016/000251

Complainant : Mr. Sashi Bhusan Mohanty  
S/o. Shri Krushna Ballav Mohanty  
At- Revu Street, Gopalpur-on-Sea,  
Dist-Ganjam, Odisha

Public Authority : The CPIO  
Rajiv Gandhi Centre for Aquaculture  
Orissa State Shrimp Production and Research Centre,  
(OSSPARC), Gopalpur on Sea, Ganjam, Odisha - 761 002

Date of Hearing : 28.09.2016  
Date of Decision : 28.09.2016

## Presence:

Complainant : Absent  
CPIO : Shri Rajeeesh G., Asst. Accounts Manager

## FACTS:

- I. Vide RTI application dated **06.05.2016**, the Complainant sought information on **11 issues**.
- II. CPIO, response is not on record.
- III. The First Appeal (FA) is not on record.
- IV. First Appellate Authority (FAA), is not on record.
- V. Grounds for the Complaint filed on **21.06.2016**, 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

It would be seen here that the complainant, vide his RTI Application dated **06.05.2016**, sought information from the respondents on 11 issues as contained therein. Respondents vide their response dated **05.06.2016**, denied the required information to the complainant by stating as under:

“It is hereby stated that RGCA does not fall under the definition of ‘Public Authority’ under section 2(h) of the Right to Information Act and therefore is not bound to comply with the obligation under the RTI Act to furnish information to any citizen.”

2. The Commission heard the submissions made by respondents at length. The Commission also perused the case-file **thoroughly**; specifically, **nature of issues** raised by the complainant in his RTI application dated **06.05.2016**, respondent’s response dated **05.06.2016**, and also the contents of complaint.
3. Furthermore, the Commission thinks that Complainant must have appeared, in person or through someone, in such situations, to press his complaint before the Commission, after all, it is his case to be pursued strongly. The Commission further feels that it was complainant’s duty to argue and prove that “**Rajiv Gandhi Centre for Aquaculture**” does fall under the four corners of **Public Authority** as defined under **section 2(h) of the RTI Act 2005**. However, the complainant is absent **deliberately**, to press his case, 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. Thus, the Complainant’s Complaint deserves to be **closed**. Therefore, it is **closed**.

The Complaint is disposed of accordingly.

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

Authenticated true copy

(Krishan Avtar Talwar)  
Deputy Secretary

The CPIO  
Rajiv Gandhi Centre for Aquaculture  
(Ministry of Commerce & Industry)  
Orissa State Shrimp Production and Research Centre,  
(OSSPARC), Gopalpur on Sea, Ganjam  
Odisha - 761 002

Mr. Sashi Bhusan Mohanty  
S/o. Shri Krushna Ballav Mohanty  
At- Revu Street, Gopalpur-on-Sea,  
Dist-Ganjam, Odisha