

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

File No. CIC/VS/C/2013/000609/KY

Complainant : Shri Madan Gopal Pedawal
Pedawal Industries, D-20-22
Industrial Area, Hanumangarh Junction
Uttar Pradesh-335512

Public Authority : The CPIO
M/o Consumer Affairs, Food Corporation of India
159 P Block, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan, Pin-335001
The CPIO
Food Corporation of India
Zonal Office (N), A-2A-2B, Sec-24
Noida, Uttar Pradesh-201301

Date of Hearing : 20.09.2016
Date of Decision : 20.09.2016

Presence:

Complainant : Absent
CPIO : Shri Dev Kumar, Manager

FACTS:

- I. Vide RTI application dated **31.05.2010 & 31.07.2013**, the Complainant sought information on **sole issue**.
- II. CPIO, vide its response dated **18.06.2010, 18/19.06.2010, 13.08.2013 & 29.08.2013**, has reportedly provided the information to the Complainant.
- 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 **01.10.2013**, 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 **31.05.2010 & 31.07.2013**, sought information from the respondents on the issue as contained therein. Respondents vide their response dated **18.06.2010, 18/19.06.2010, 13.08.2013 & 29.08.2013**, provided the required information to the complainant. Being aggrieved by the aforesaid response, complainant has filed his complaint dated **01.10.2013** before the 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
M/o Consumer Affairs, Food Corporation of India
159 P Block, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan, Pin-335001

The CPIO
Food Corporation of India
Zonal Office (N), A-2A-2B, Sec-24
Noida, Uttar Pradesh-201301

Shri Madan Gopal Pediwal
Pediwal Industries, D-20-22
Industrial Area, Hanumangarh Junction
Uttar Pradesh-335512