

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

File No. CIC/SS/C/2013/000281/KY

Complainant : Shri Krishna Kumar Mantri
Neelamber Vihar, Block-I, Flat No. 137
40, Dum Dum Road, Kolkata-700074

Public Authority : The Foreign Trade Development Officer & CPIO
M/o. Commerce & Industry, Dte. Gen. of Foreign Trade,
UdyogBhavan, New Delhi

The Foreign Trade Development Officer & CPIO
M/o. Commerce, O/o. the Jt. Dte. Gen. of Foreign Trade, Plot No.
117, 1st Main Road, K. K. Nagar, Madurai

Date of Hearing : 29.08.2016
Date of Decision : 29.08.2016

Presence:

Complainant : Absent
CPIO : Shri R. Muthuraj, JDGFT & Appellate Authority and
Shri Suhrut Kumar Mohapatra, Dy. DGFT & CPIO

FACTS:

- I. Vide RTI application dated **24.09.2012**, the complainant sought information on **3 issues**.
- II. CPIO, vide its response dated **26.11.2012**, **30.11.2012**, reportedly not provided the information to the Complainant.
- III. The First Appeal (FA) was filed on **05.12.2012**, as desired information not provided.
- IV. First Appellate Authority (FAA), vide its order dated **09.01.2013**, allowed for the inspection and provided the information to the Complainant.
- V. Grounds for the Complaint filed on **18.05.2013**, 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

It is pertinent to mention here that the complainant, vide his RTI Application dated **24.09.2012**, has sought information from the respondents on **3 issues**. Respondents vide their response dated **08.11.2012**, asked the complainant to deposit the requisite fee of ` 1020/- for getting the required information from the respondents. Further, complainant deposited the requisite fee of ` 1020/- on **01.02.2013**. Furthermore, respondents vide their subsequent response dated **23.05.2013**, provided the required information, running into 548 pages, to the complainant.

2. 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.
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 Foreign Trade Development Officer & CPIO
M/o Commerce & Industry,
Dte. Gen. of Foreign Trade,
Udyog Bhavan, New Delhi

The Foreign Trade Development Officer & CPIO
M/o Commerce & Industry,
O/o. the Jt. Dte. Gen. of Foreign Trade,
Plot No. 117,1st Main Road, K. K. Nagar, Madurai

Shri Krishna Kumar Mantri
Neelamber Vihar, Block-I, Flat No. 137
40, Dum Dum Road, Kolkata-700074