

# CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

File No. CIC/YA/C/2014/000411/KY

Complainant : Shri M. Selvam  
No. 371, Add New Law Chamber  
High Court, Chennai-600104

Public Authority : The CPIO  
CSIR-Central Leather Research Institute  
Adyar, Chennai-600020, Tamilnadu

Date of Hearing : 07.09.2016  
Date of Decision : 07.09.2016

## Presence:

Complainant : Absent  
CPIO : Shri G. Chandrasekar, Sr. Principal Scientist & CPIO

## FACTS:

- I. Vide RTI application dated **29.04.2014**, the appellant sought information on **12 issues**.
- II. CPIO, vide its response dated **30.05.2014**, has provided the information to the Appellant.
- III. The First Appeal (FA) was filed on **29.05.2014**, as desired information not provided.
- IV. First Appellate Authority (FAA), vide its order dated **11.06.2014**, upheld the decision of CPIO.
- V. Grounds for the Complaint filed on **27.06.2014**, 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 **29.04.2014**, sought information from the respondents on 12 issues as contained therein. Respondents vide their response dated **30.05.2014**, provided the required information to the complainant. Being aggrieved by the aforesaid response, FA was filed by the complainant on **29.05.2014** before the FAA, who vide his order dated **11.06.2014**, upheld the decision of CPIO. Hence, complainant has filed his complaint dated **27.06.2014** before the Commission.

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 CPIO

CSIR-Central Leather Research Institute

Adyar, Chennai-600020, Tamilnadu

Shri M. Selvam

No. 371, Add New Law Chamber

High Court, Chennai-600104