

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
2nd Floor, 'B' Wing, August Kranti Bhawan,
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi -110067
Tel : +91-11-26717355

Complaint No. CIC/SS/C/2014/900031

Complainant: Shri Maniram Sharma,
R/o Nakul Niwas, Behind Roadways Depot,
Sardarshahar-331403-7, Distt. Churu,
Rajasthan.

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer/Registrar,
Delhi High Court, Shershah Road, New Delhi-
110003

Date of Hearing: 24.08.2016

Date of Decision: 24.08.2016

ORDER

Facts:

1. The complainant filed RTI application dated 05.11.2013 through e-mails seeking copy of Notes prepared on his communications:

- A. Constitutionality of RTI rules framed by Delhi High Court dated 04.11.2013
- B. Rule of Law and prioritization of cases dated 04.11.2013
- C. Compliance of suo motu disclosure dated 04.11.2013
- D. Bail and Stay in criminal justice system dated 02.11.2013
- E. Constitution of special Courts dated 02.11.2013
- F. Proactive disclosure u/s 4 of RTI Act – Exhibition of powers and duties of officers dated 30.10.2013
- G. Strike by Advocates dated 12.08.2013
- H. Misuse of judicial process dated 04.09.2013
- I. Transparency in appointment of subordinate judges dated 14.04.2013

2. The CPIO response is not on record. The complainant filed a complaint on 18.11.2013 with the Commission.

Hearing:

3. The respondent participated in the hearing. The complainant did not participate in the hearing.

4. The respondent stated that the complainant had filed RTI application through electronic form stating therein that he had paid the RTI fee through electronic money order of Rs. 50/-. The respondent stated that the said money order seems to have not been received.

5. The respondent stated that as per para 3 of Delhi High Court (Right to Information) Rules, 2006, a person who makes a request through electronic form shall ensure that the requisite fee is deposited in cash, Indian Postal Order, Demand Drafts, Pay Order with the authorised person within 15 days of his sending the request through the electronic form and through post, failing which his application shall be treated as dismissed. The respondent stated that they have not received the RTI fee through prescribed mode of payment.

Observations:

6. It is observed that the complainant has filed large number of appeals/complaints with different public authorities. He never attends the hearing.

7. The action/steps taken by the respondent in dealing with the RTI application is satisfactory.

Decision:

8. It would benefit the RTI applicants if the Hon'ble High Court permits deposit of fees electronically. It is advised that this may be considered.

9. Commission's intervention is not required in the matter.

The complaint is disposed of. Copy of the decision be given free of cost to the parties.

(Radha Krishna Mathur)
Chief Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy
(S. C. Sharma)
Dy. Registrar