

# CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

File No. CIC/SS/C/2013/000626/KY

Complainant : Shri H. Hanume Gowda  
Door No. 71, Honnaganahatty  
TavarekereHobli, Bangalore South-562130

Public Authority : The CPIO (RTI Cell)  
Ministry of Commerce and Industry  
Coffee Board No. 1. Dr. B R AmbedkarVeedhi,  
Bangalore-560001

Date of Hearing : 22.08.2016  
Date of Decision : 22.08.2016

## Presence:

Complainant : Absent  
CPIO : Shri Navin Kumar, OSD

## FACTS:

- I. Vide RTI application dated **10.07.2013**, the appellant sought information on **13 issues**.
- II. CPIO, vide its responses dated **01.11.2013 & 27.11.2013**, reportedly provided the required 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 **24.10.2013**, 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 **10.07.2013**, sought information from the respondents on **13 issues** as contained therein. Respondents vide their response dated **01.11.2013 & 27.11.2013**, provided the required information to the complainant. Being aggrieved by the aforesaid response, complainant has filed his complaint dated **NIL** 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 (RTI Cell)  
Ministry of Commerce and Industry  
Coffee Board No. 1, Dr. B R Ambedkar Veedhi,  
Bangalore-560001

Shri H. Hanume Gowda  
Door No. 71, Honnaganahatty  
Tavarekere Hobli, Bangalore South-562130