

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
2nd Floor, 'B' Wing, August Kranti Bhawan,
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi -110066
Tel : +91-11-26186535

Appeal No. CIC/VS/A/2015/001186

Appellant: S. Deenadayalayan
IRWO Chennai, Phase-II, Subscribers, Association,
145/4 ICF West Colony, Chennai-6000038

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer
GM(AR)-IRWO Rly Office Complex, Shivaji Bridge,
New Delhi

Date of Hearing: 28.11.2016
Date of Decision: 28.11.2016

ORDER

Facts:

1. The appellant filed RTI application dated 24.07.2014 seeking information pertaining to Chennai Phase-II Scheme Project and documents in relation thereto like tenders quoted for this project from 2003 onwards, name of contractors and other allied details.
2. The CPIO responded on 20.11.2014. The appellant filed First Appeal dated nil with First Appellate Authority (FAA). The FAA responded on 29.01.2015. The appellant filed second appeal on 01.05.2015 before the Commission.

Hearing:

3. The appellant and the respondent both participated in the hearing.
4. The appellant stated that the sought for information has not been provided to him by citing that it is voluminous and may lead to disproportionate diversion of resources. The appellant stated that the project is in progress for past 11 years and reasons for delay have not been provided to him. The appellant stated that he is an allottee and beneficiary.

5. The respondent stated that the appellant has been replied to vide letter dated 20.11.2014. The respondent stated that the appellant is seeking tenders quoted for the said project from 2003 onwards. The respondent stated they have not denied for the information. The respondent stated that the appellant was requested to visit the IRWO office on mutually convenient date and inspect the record and take pertinent documents. The respondent stated that the records comprise of about 110 files and run in to large number of pages. The respondent stated that the appellant may inspect any file and take any information that he wanted to obtain. The appellant stated that they have nothing to hide and they are ready to provide the information.

6. The respondent stated that the first appellate authority vide its order dated 29.01.2015 had disposed of the first appeal having concurred with the findings of the CPIO.

Discussion/ observation:

7. On query from the Commission, the appellant refused to inspect the record.

8. The action/steps taken by the respondent in dealing with the RTI application is satisfactory. However, the sought for information can be provided on payment of copying fee as per RTI rules.

Decision:

9. Respondent is directed to raise a bill of copying fee to the appellant and on payment of copying fee, the information shall be provided to him within 45 days of this order.

The appeal is disposed of. Copy of the order be given to the parties free of cost.

(Radha Krishna Mathur)
Chief Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(S.C. Sharma)
Dy. Registrar