

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

File No. CIC/KY/C/2016/000257

Complainant : Shri P. S. Sawhney
130 Sec-45-A, Chandigarh-160047

Public Authority : The CPIO
Department of Urban Planning, Chandigarh Agmn.,
DeluxBldg, Sec-9 Chandigarh-160009

Date of Hearing : 07.10.2016
Date of Decision : 07.10.2016

Presence:

Complainant : Absent
CPIO : Absent

FACTS:

- I. Vide RTI application dated **31.05.2016**, the Complainant sought information on **3 issues**.
- II. CPIO, response is not on record.
- III. The First Appeal (FA) is not on record.
- IV. First Appellate Authority (FAA), order is not on record.
- V. Grounds for the Complaint filed on **06.06.2016**, 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 as per the contents of complainant's complaint dated **06.06.2016**, there appears that in the captioned petition, **no prayer clause**, as provided under the provisions of RTI Act 2005, has been incorporated by the Petitioner. Thus, it is not known to the Commission, as to why petitioner has filed his petition before this Commission. In other words, no relief, as provided under the provisions of RTI Act 2005, has been sought from the Commission in his petition.

2. Apart from above, it is pertinent to mention here that despite of our **due notice**, neither Petitioner 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 Petitioner must have appeared, in such situations, to press his Petition before the Commission, after all, it is his case to be pursued strongly but Petitioner is also absent **deliberately**, despite of our due notice. Thus, it shows the intention of the Petitioner that he is not interested, **at all**, in pursuing his own case before the Commission.

3. 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

Department of Urban Planning, Chandigarh Agmn.,
Deluxe Bldg, Sec-9 Chandigarh-160009

Shri P. S. Sawhney

130 Sec-45-A, Chandigarh-160047

