

**CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION**

2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, August Kranti Bhawan,  
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066

**Decision No. CIC/SB/A/2015/000377**

**Dated 23.11.2016**

**Appellant** : Shri Pankaj Bansal,  
108/04, Sector 01,  
PushpVihar,  
New Delhi.

**Respondent** : Central Public Information Officer,  
Department of Personnel & Training,  
North Block,  
New Delhi-110001.

**Date of Hearing** : 23.11.2016

**Relevant dates emerging from the appeal:**

RTI application filed on : 22.07.2015

Second appeal filed on : 09.10.2015

**ORDER**

1. Shri Pankaj Bansal filed an application dated 22.07.2015 under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) before the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO), Department of Personnel and Training (DoPT) seeking copies of all the file notings and the correspondences along with relevant documents/reports/records pertaining to issuance of Notification dated 28<sup>th</sup> October, 1985 by DoPT vide File No. 204/6/84-AVD.II relating to appointment of officers to act as Estate Officers in Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) under Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorized Occupants) Act, 1971.

2. The appellant filed a second appeal dated 09.10.2015 before the Commission on the grounds that neither the CPIO nor the First Appellate Authority (FAA) replied to his RTI application. The appellant requested the Commission to direct the CPIO to provide the information, impose penalty under Section 20(1) of the RTI Act on the CPIO for not providing information or any response within the time frame set under the RTI Act, 2005.

**Hearing:**

3. Both the appellant Shri Pankaj Bansal and the respondent Shri S.P.R. Tripathy, CPIO and Under Secretary, DoPT were present in person.

4. The appellant submitted that the information sought has not been provided to him by the respondent. The appellant further submitted that the FAA vide his order dated 14.01.2016 had directed the CPIO to provide information within fifteen days. However, in compliance of the said order, information was not provided to him and instead the CPIO vide his letter dated 18.03.2016 requested him to come and inspect the relevant files and when the inspection was sought, he was informed that the relevant file is not traceable.

5. The respondent submitted that in compliance with the order of the FAA dated 14.01.2015, the appellant was requested vide letter dated 18.03.2015 to inspect the relevant records as the information sought relates to old records. The respondent further submitted that the appellant was also requested that in case he desires to obtain information by post, he may intimate the same to the CPIO. However, no intimation from the appellant was received by the CPIO.

**Decision:**

6. The Commission, after hearing the submissions of both the parties and perusing the records, observes that the information sought does not seem to be too voluminous. In view of this, the Commission, directs the respondent to

---

provide copies of the documents requested by the appellant, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

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**