

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

2nd Floor, August Kranti Bhawan,
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066

Decision No. CIC/SB/A/2016/000621

Dated 23.11.2016

Appellant : ShriAnwar Khan,
RTI Counseling Center,
Post Box 11658,
PO Pushpa Bhawan
New Delhi-110 062.

Respondent : Central Public Information Officer,
Delhi Police, South District,
HauzKhas, New Delhi-110 016.

Date of Hearing : 23.11.2016

Relevant dates emerging from the appeal:

RTI application filed on : 18.12.2015

First appeal filed on : 03.02.2016

Second appeal filed on : 10.03.2016

ORDER

1. ShriAnwar Khan filed an application dated 18.12.2015 under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) before the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO), South District, Delhi Police seeking information regarding FIRs lodged from 01.06.2012 to 31.12.2012 on charges of Section 379 Indian Penal Code, 1860.

2. The appellant filed a second appeal dated 10.03.2016 before the Commission on the grounds that no information has been provided either by the CPIO or by the First Appellate Authority (FAA), South District, Delhi Police.

Hearing:

3. Both the appellant ShriAnwar Khan and the respondent ShriJai Bhagwan, Sub-Inspector, South District, Delhi Police were present in person.

4. The appellant submitted that he had sought information as to whether any case of Section 379 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 was registered in any of the Police Stations of South District. However, no response has been received from the CPIO. The appellant further submitted that his first appeal has also not been disposed of by the FAA, Delhi Police.

5. The respondent submitted that the appellant was informed vide letter dated 19.01.2016 that the information sought is voluminous in nature, compiling which would disproportionately divert the resources of the respondent office and, therefore, the same is exempted from disclosure under Section 7(9) of the RTI Act. Nonetheless, the appellant was advised that if he still desires the information, he may inspect the records of the various Police Stations of South District. The respondent further submitted that the appellant had filed a first appeal on the ground that no reply of the CPIO was received by him and, therefore, copy of the CPIO's reply was again provided to the appellant along with the order of the FAA dated 17.03.2016.

Decision:

6. The Commission, after hearing the submissions of both the parties and perusing the records, observes that as per the appellant no reply has been received by him from the respondent. However, as per the respondent, a reply from the CPIO as well as the FAA's order were furnished to the appellant. In

view of the foregoing, as per the directions of the Commission, a copy of the reply of the CPIO dated 19.01.2016 as well as the copy of the FAA's order dated 17.03.2106 was provided to the appellant during the hearing. In view of this, no further intervention of the Commission is required in the matter.

7. With the above observations, the appeal is disposed of.
8. Copy of the decision be provided free of cost to the parties.

(Sudhir Bhargava)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(V.K. Sharma)
Designated Officer