

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/2014/000510/KY**

Complainant : Shri Pawan Kumar Verma
Advocate Court Compound, Kashipur
Dist.-Udham Singh Nagar, Uttrakhand

Public Authority : The CPIO
M/o. Commerce and Industry, Dept. of Industrial Policy
& Promotion, UdyogBhawan, New Delhi

Date of Hearing : 08.09.2016
Date of Decision : 08.09.2016

Presence:

Complainant : Absent
CPIO : Shri Ashish Dutta, Secretary & CPIO

FACTS:

- I. Vide RTI application dated **01.04.2014**, the appellant sought information on **4 issues**.
- II. CPIO, vide its response dated **27.05.2014**, has reportedly provided the information to the Appellant.
- III. The First Appeal (FA) is not on record.
- IV. First Appellate Authority (FAA), is not on record.
- V. Grounds for the Complaint filed on **16.05.2014**, 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 would be seen here that the complainant, vide his RTI Application dated **01.04.2014**, sought information from the respondents on 4 issues as contained therein. Respondents vide their response dated **27.05.2014**, provided the required information to the complainant. Being aggrieved by the aforesaid response, complainant has filed his complaint dated **16.05.2014** before the Commission.

2. Further, on careful perusal of the contents of complainant's complaint dated **16.05.2014**, there appears that in the captioned petition, **no prayer clause**, as provided under the provisions of RTI Act 2005, has been incorporated by the Petitioner. Thus, it is not known

to the Commission, as to why petitioner has filed his petition before this Commission. In other words, no relief, as provided under the provisions of RTI Act 2005, has been sought from the Commission in his petition.

3. 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.
4. 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
M/o. Commerce and Industry,
Dept. of Industrial Policy & Promotion,
Udyog Bhawan, New Delhi

Shri Pawan Kumar Verma
Advocate Court Compound, Kashipur
Dist.-Udham Singh Nagar, Uttrakhand