

# 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/SS/C/2013/000273/KY

Complainant : Shri Dilip Shrishirmal  
213, Station Road, Mahasamund  
Chattisgarh-493445

Public Authority : The CPIO  
Ministry of Commerce & Industry  
Export Credit Guarantee Corporation of India Limited,  
No. 1, Ground Floor, Shrishti Sankul Apartment,  
Near Bole Petrol Pump, Opp. Maharaj Baug Club,  
VIP Road, Dharam Peth, Nagpur-400010

Date of Hearing : 15.09.2016  
Date of Decision : 15.09.2016

## Presence:

Complainant : Absent  
CPIO : Absent

## FACTS:

- I. Vide RTI application dated **22.08.2012**, the applicant sought information on **sole issue**.
- II. CPIO, vide its response dated **27.08.2012**, has provided the information to the Appellant.
- III. The First Appeal (FA) was filed on **01.09.2012**, as desired information not provided.
- IV. First Appellate Authority (FAA), vide its order dated **26.04.2013**, provided the information to the Appellant.
- V. CIC vide its Order dated **17.04.2013**, directed First Appellate Authority to disposed off the First Appeal.
- VI. Grounds for the Complaint filed on **07.05.2012**, 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 Hon. CIC vide its earlier order dated **17.04.2013**, passed by Madam Sushma Singh, Hon. Information Commissioner, in file No. **CIC/SS/C/2013/000079**, disposed of then complaint by directing the learned FAA to dispose of the FA dated 01.09.2012.

2. It is pertinent to mention here that in compliance of Hon. CIC's earlier order dated **17.04.2013**, Shri M. Ramakrishnan, Regional Manager & FAA, vide his order dated **26.04.2013**, disposed of the complainant's First Appeal (FA) dated **01.09.2012** by upholding the views of CPIO. Being aggrieved with the aforesaid FAA's order, complainant has filed his complaint, second time, 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 CPIO  
Ministry of Commerce & Industry  
Export Credit Guarantee Corporation of India Limited,  
No. 1, Ground Floor, Shrishti Sankul Apartment,  
Near Bole Petrol Pump, Opp. Maharaj Baug Club,  
VIP Road, Dharam Peth, Nagpur-400010

Shri Dilip Shrishirmal  
213, Station Road, Mahasamund  
Chattisgarh-493445