

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

File No. **CIC/DS/C/2012/000730/KY**

Complainant : Shri Chander Mohan Sharma
16/4-B, Sangeeta Apartments
Juhu Road, Santa Cruz (West), Mumbai-400049

Public Authority : The CPIO
O/o. the Dy. Commissioner Chandigarh Administration,
1st Floor, Estate Office, Sec-17, Chandigarh-160017

Date of Hearing : 16.09.2016
Date of Decision : 16.09.2016

Presence:

Complainant : Absent
CPIO : Shri Mohan Singh, Superintendent & CPIO

FACTS:

- I. Vide RTI application dated **10.08.2010**, (as per Complaint) (Application is not on record).
- II. CPIO, vide his response dated 13.07.2012, allegedly provided the required information to the appellent.
- III. The First Appeal (FA) is not on record.
- IV. First Appellate Authority (FAA), order is not on record.
- V. CIC vide its Order dated **30.04.2012**, directed respondent to provide the information to the Appellant.
- VI. Grounds for the Complaint filed on **29.05.2012**, 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

At the outset, it is stated here that Hon. CIC vide its earlier order dated **30.04.2012**, passed by Smt. Deepak Sandhu, Hon. Information Commissioner, in file No. **CIC/DS/A/2011/002118**, disposed of then second appeal by directing the CPIO to provide the required information to then Appellant.

2. It is pertinent to mention here that in compliance of Hon. CIC's earlier order dated **30.04.2012**, APIO, vide his response dated **13.07.2012**, provided the required information to the appellant.
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

O/o. the Dy. Commissioner Chandigarh Administration,

1st Floor, Estate Office, Sec-17, Chandigarh-160017

Shri Chander Mohan Sharma

16/4-B, Sangeeta Apartments

Juhu Road, Santa Cruz (West), Mumbai-400049