

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

2nd Floor, August Kranti Bhawan,
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066

Decision No. CIC/SB/A/2015/000368

Dated 24.11.2016

Appellant : Shri Dean,
R/o 430, Gali No. 8,
Durgapuri Extension,
Delhi-110093.

Respondent : Central Public Information Officer,
Delhi Police O/o PIO,
North East District,
Old P.S. GTB Enclave
Delhi-110 095.

Date of Hearing : 24.11.2016

Relevant dates emerging from the appeal:

RTI application filed on : 22.06.2015

CPIO's reply : 20.07.2015

First appeal filed on : 01.08.2015

FAA's order : 18.08.2015

Second appeal filed on : 21.09.2015

ORDER

1. Shri Dean filed an application dated 22.06.2015 under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) before the Public Information Officer (PIO), North East District, Delhi Police seeking information on five points pertaining to the NCR No. 852/2014 lodged by him in Jyoti Nagar Police Station regarding snatching of his mobile phone, including (i) status of his lost

mobile phone – whether it has been traced or not and (ii) whether this phone was put on surveillance or not and (iii) certified copy of letter vide which the phone was put on surveillance.

2. The appellant filed a second appeal dated 21.09.2015 before the Commission on the grounds that complete information has not been provided by the APIO and that the APIO did not comply with the order of the First Appellate Authority (FAA) to provide him point-wise information.

Hearing:

3. The appellant's representative Dr. Rakesh Kumar and Shri Sanjay Singh, ACP(HQ), Delhi Police were present in person.

4. The appellant submitted that complete information in respect of point no.4 of the RTI application has not been provided to him.

5. The respondent submitted that information was provided to the appellant vide letter dated 20.07.2015. The respondent further submitted that in compliance with the FAA's order dated 18.08.2015, information was provided to the appellant on 11.09.2015. The respondent submitted that a copy of the letter by which the lost Mobile phone of the appellant was put on surveillance was also provided. The letter also has the names of the officer responsible for putting the lost Mobile Phone on surveillance. The respondent again provided a copy of the letter dated 11.09.2015 along with photo copies of the CDRs (Call Detail Reports) upto 10.09.2015 of the lost mobile phone during the hearing. The appellant expressed his satisfaction with the information provided to him.

Decision:

6. The Commission, after hearing the submissions of both the parties and perusing the records, observes that due information has been provided to the appellant. Hence, intervention of the Commission is not required in the matter.

7. Copy of the decision be provided free of cost to the parties.

(Sudhir Bhargava)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(V.K. Sharma)
Designated Officer