

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

Decision No. CIC/SB/A/2015/000373

Dated 28.11.2016

Appellant : ShriRatan Das,
B-1248, Gautam Puri,
Phase-2, Badarpur,
New Delhi-110 076.

Respondent : Central Public Information Officer,
Delhi Police,O/o DCP,
South East District,Sarita Vihar,
Delhi.

Date of Hearing : 28.11.2016

Relevant dates emerging from the appeal:

RTI application filed on : 29.06.2015

CPIO's reply :
31.07.2015/03.08.2015/05.08.2015/06.08.2015/24.09.2015

First appeal filed on : 28.07.2015

FAA's order : 28.08.2015

Second appeal filed on : 12.10.2015

ORDER

1. Shri Ratan Das filed an application dated 29.06.2015 under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) before the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO), Police Headquarters, Delhi seeking information on fourteen points pertaining to security provided to VIPs etc.

2. The appellant filed a second appeal dated 12.10.2015 before the Commission on the grounds that he is not satisfied with the information provided to him by the CPIO as well as the First Appellate Authority (FAA).

Hearing:

3. The appellant Shri Ratan Das and the respondent S.I. Sanjeev Kumar, South East District, Delhi Police were present in person.

4. The appellant submitted that his RTI application was forwarded to the various districts of Delhi Police. The appellant stated that the replies received from the various CPIOs are contradictory. The appellant further submitted that the CPIO, South East District, Delhi Police vide letter dated 24.09.2015 had provided information on point nos.4 and 5 of the RTI application which contradicts the replies provided to him by the other CPIOs.

5. The respondent submitted that in compliance with the FAA's order dated 28.08.2015, the CPIO vide letter dated 24.09.2015 had provided information on point nos.4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of the RTI application to the appellant. The respondent clarified that the appellant was informed that on receipt of a complaint a F.I.R. is registered and thereafter further action in the matter would be taken as per the Circular No.01/2013 issued by Delhi Police. Hence, the information provided was correct and complete. The respondent further submitted that the information provided is not in contradiction with the replies provided by the other CPIOs.

Decision:

6. The Commission, after hearing the submissions of both the parties and perusing the records, observes that the due information has been provided to the appellant. Hence, no further intervention by the Commission is not required in the matter.

7. With the above observations, the appeal is disposed of.
8. Copy of the decision be provided free of cost to the parties.

(Sudhir Bhargava)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(V.K. Sharma)
Designated Officer