

**CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION**

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

**Decision No. CIC/SB/A/2015/000489**

**Dated 29.11.2016**

**Appellant** : ShriDharam Pal Singh Arya,  
89-T, Sector-4, DIZ Area,  
Baba Kharak Singh Marg,  
New Delhi-110 001.

**Respondent** : Central Public Information Officer,  
Delhi Police,O/o ADCP,  
New Delhi District,Parliament Street,  
Delhi – 110 001.

**Date of Hearing** : 29.11.2016

**Relevant dates emerging from the appeal:**

RTI application filed on : 22.07.2015

CPIO's reply : 20.08.2015/16.09.2015

First appeal filed on : 16.09.2015

FAA's order : 09.10.2015

Second appeal filed on : 02.11.2015

**ORDER**

1. Shri Dharam Pal Singh Arya filed an application dated 22.07.2015 under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) before the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO), New Delhi District, Delhi Police seeking information on three points pertaining to action taken on a PCR call made on 23.03.2015.

2. The appellant filed a second appeal dated 02.11.2015 before the Commission on the grounds that he is not satisfied with the information provided to him by the CPIO on point no.1 of the RTI application.

**Hearing:**

3. The appellant Shri Dharam Pal Singh Arya was not present despite notice. The respondent Dr. Anand Dabhi, ACP, New Delhi District, Delhi Police was present in person.

4. The respondent submitted that complete the correct information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 20.08.2015. The respondent submitted that the appellant had made a PCR call on 23.05.2015 regarding an illegal entry in his house by a thief. However, the police officer (ASI Omparkash) who had enquired into the Call was informed that the matter related to a domestic spat between the appellant's wife and his daughter-in-law. The respondent submitted that this is corroborated by the statement of the appellant as well as Shri Pawan Kumar brother of the appellant's daughter-in-law. The respondent further submitted that as per the appellant's statement a neighbor of his daughter-in-law had visited his house on 23.05.2015 but by mistake his family members thought that a thief had entered the home and hence, a PCR call was made.

**Decision:**

5. The Commission, after hearing the submissions of the respondent and perusing the records, observes that due information has been provided to the appellant. Hence, no further intervention of the Commission is required in the matter.

6. With the above observations, the appeal is disposed of.

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**