

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

2nd Floor, 'B' Wing, August Kranti Bhawan,

Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi -110067

Tel : +91-11-26717355

Complaint No. CIC/SS/C/2014/900055

Complainant: Shri Maniram Sharma,
R/o Nakul Niwas,
Behind Roadways Depot,
Sardarshahar-331403-7,
Distt. Churu, Rajasthan.

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer/Registrar,
Calcutta High Court, 3 Esplanade Row West
Kolkata-700001, W.B.

Date of Hearing: 24.08.2016

Date of Decision: 24.08.2016

ORDER

Facts:

1. The complainant filed RTI application dated 16.11.2013 through e-mails seeking copy of Notes prepared on his complaints dated 14.11.2013, 12.10.2013, 11.11.2013, 02.11.2013, 06.10.2013 and tentative date of full compliance of DOPT OM No. 1/6/2011-IR dated 15.04.2013 regarding suo motu disclosure.
2. The CPIO responded on 09.12.2013. The complainant filed a complaint on 20.12.2013 with the Commission.

Hearing:

3. The respondent participated in the hearing personally. The complainant did not participate in the hearing.
4. The respondent stated that they have responded to the RTI application vide letter dated 09.12.2013. The respondent stated that they

could not find any mention of who he had addressed the referred messages from his application. The respondent stated that there are two sides in the High Court; the appellate side and the original side. The respondent stated that the complainant did not mention the department or side of the High Court.

5. The respondent stated that the complainant did not pay the RTI fee to the appropriate authority. The respondent stated that there are separate Public Information Officer and Appellate Authority for the aforesaid sides of the High Court.

6. The respondent stated that the complainant was advised to re-submit his application annexing the photo copies of the messages which he mentioned in his application so that it would be possible for them to trace out the said matters.

Observations:

7. It is observed that the complainant has filed large number of appeals/complaints with different public authorities. He never attends the hearing.

8. The action/steps taken by the respondent in dealing with the RTI application is satisfactory.

Decision:

9. Commission's intervention is not required in the matter.

The complaint is disposed of. Copy of the decision be given free of cost to the parties.

(Radha Krishna Mathur)
Chief Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(S. C. Sharma)
Dy. Registrar