

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

File No. CIC/RM/C/2014/000505/KY

Complainant : Mr. Praveen Sakhuja
LD- 119, SFS Flats,Pitampura
Delhi - 110034

Public Authority : The CPIO
Ministry of Commerce and Industry
Export Inspection Council of India
3rd Floor, NDYMCA Cultural Centre Building,
1 Jai Singh Road, New Delhi -110001

Date of Hearing : 14.09.2016
Date of Decision : 14.09.2016

Presence:

Complainant : Absent
CPIO : Dr. Amit Sharma, Joint Director & FAA

FACTS:

- I. Vide RTI application dated **01.05.2014**, the Complainant sought information on the issues.
- II. CPIO, vide its response dated **05.05.2014**, has provided the information to the Complainant.
- III. The First Appeal (FA) is not on record.
- IV. First Appellate Authority (FAA), order is not on record.
- V. Grounds for the Complaint filed on **08.05.2014**, 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 **01.05.2014**, has sought information from the respondents on **11 issues**. Respondents vide their response dated **05.05.2014**, provided the required information to the complainant. Being aggrieved by the aforesaid response, Complaint was filed by the complainant on **08.05.2014**, before this 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

Ministry of Commerce and Industry

Export Inspection Council of India

3rd Floor, NDYMCA Cultural Centre Building,

1 Jai Singh Road, New Delhi -110001

Mr. Praveen Sakhuja

LD- 119, SFS Flats, Pitampura

Delhi - 110034