

**CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION**

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

**Decision No. CIC/SB/A/2015/000434**

**Dated 29.11.2016**

**Appellant** : Shri Avtar Vinayak,  
BW-30B,  
Shalimar Bagh,  
New Delhi-110088.

**Respondent** : Central Public Information Officer,  
Delhi Police, O/o ADCP-cum-PIO,  
Central District, Daryaganj,  
Delhi-110002.

**Date of Hearing** : 29.11.2016

**Relevant dates emerging from the appeal:**

RTI application filed on : 08.06.2015

CPIO's reply : 01.07.2015/31.08.2015

First appeal filed on : 07.07.2015

FAA's order : 06.08.2015

Second appeal filed on : 19.09.2015

**ORDER**

1. Shri Avtar Vinayak filed an application dated 08.06.2015 under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) before the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO), Central District, Delhi Police seeking information on five points pertaining to verification of tenants, including (i) whether the concerned police authority has issued notification for mandatory police verification of tenants in Darya Ganj area along with a copy of the same and (ii) whether police officials have carried out tenant verification checks in the area of Darya Ganj police station in the past one year, if yes, number of property owners who had not got

---

the tenant verification done and number of cases in which action has been taken against such property owners.

2. Shri Avtar Vinayak filed a second appeal dated 19.09.2015 before the Commission on the grounds that the CPIO, furnished totally evasive, incomplete and misleading information and that the information provided by the CPIO in compliance with the order of the First Appellate Authority (FAA) was also not correct. The appellant requested the Commission to direct the CPIO to furnish complete and specific information sought by him.

**Hearing:**

3. Shri Kapil Vinayak, representative of the appellant Shri Avtar Vinayak and the respondent Shri Ashok Tyagi, ACP, Delhi Police were present in person.

4. The appellant submitted that he has since received the information after filing the second appeal and that he is satisfied with the information so provided. Therefore, he does not want to pursue the matter any further. The appellant requested the Commission that he may be permitted to withdraw his second appeal in the matter.

**Decision:**

5. The appeal is dismissed as 'Withdrawn'.

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

**(Sudhir Bhargava)**  
**Information Commissioner**

**Authenticated true copy**

**(V.K. Sharma)**  
**Designated Officer**

---