

# 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/2016/000256**

Complainant : Shri K. Madhavan  
No. 11, Crescent Raod, Shenoy Nagar  
Chennai-600030

Public Authority : The Asstt. Dev. Commissioner & CPIO  
M/o. Commerce, SEZ Section, Udyog Bhawan,  
New Delhi-110011

Date of Hearing : 13.10.2016  
Date of Decision : 13.10.2016

## **Presence:**

Complainant : Absent  
CPIO : Absent

## **FACTS:**

- I. Vide RTI application dated **15.03.2013**, (as per FAO) is not on record.
- II. CPIO, vide its response dated **12.04.2016**, reportedly not provided the information to the Complainant.
- III. The First Appeal (FA) was filed on **24.02.2016**, as desired information not provided.
- IV. First Appellate Authority (FAA), vide its order dated **12.02.2016**, denied to provide the information u/s 8 (1) (d) and 11 (1)
- V. CIC vide its Order dated **14.01.2016**, remanded back to First Appellate Authority.
- VI. Grounds for the Complaint filed on **20.07.2016**, are contained in the Memorandum of Complaint.

## **HEARING**

**Complainant as well as respondent opted to be absent despite of our due notice to them.**

## **DECISION**

At the outset, it is stated here that this Bench of the Commission, vide its earlier order dated **14.01.2016**, in file No. **CIC/RM/A/2014/000853/KY**, disposed of then Second Appeal by directing the learned FAA to dispose of the FA dated **29.07.2013**.

2. It is pertinent to mention here that in compliance of Hon. CIC's earlier order dated **14.01.2016**, Shri Anil Kumar Choudhary, Development Commissioner & FAA, vide his order dated **12.02.2016**, disposed of the complainant's First Appeal (FA) dated **29.07.2013**

by **denying** the required information to the appellant by taking a plea under **section 8(1)(d) read with Section 11(1) of the RTI Act 2005**. Being aggrieved with the aforesaid FAA's order, complainant has filed his complaint before this Commission.

3. Apart from above, it is to be seen here that despite of our **due notice**, neither Complainant nor the respondents appeared **either in person** or through someone, duly authorized by them before the Commission to press their cases. 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 strongly but complainant is also 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 Asstt. Dev. Commissioner & CPIO  
M/o. Commerce, SEZ Section, Udyog Bhawan,  
New Delhi-110011

Shri K. Madhavan  
No. 11, Crescent Raod, Shenoy Nagar  
Chennai-600030