

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

File No. **CIC/KY/A/2016/001188**

Appellant : Dr. Vidyanand Thakur
08, Guest House Colony, P.O. Kotma Colliery
Dist.-Anuppur, Madhya Pradesh-484336

Public Authority : The CPIO
M/o. Heavy Industries & Public Enterprises, Public Enterprises
Bhawan Block No. 14, CGO Complex, Lodi Road, New Delhi-110003

Date of Hearing : 21.09.2016
Date of Decision : 21.09.2016

Presence:

Appellant : Absent
CPIO : Shri S. Meenakshi Sundaram, Director & CPIO

FACTS:

- I. Vide RTI application dated **01.05.2016**, the Appellant sought information on **4 issues**.
- II. CPIO, vide its response dated **12.05.2016**, reportedly provided the information to the Appellant.
- III. The First Appeal (FA) was filed on **18.05.2016**, (as per FAO) as desired information not provided.
- IV. First Appellate Authority (FAA), vide its order dated **27.05.2016**, upheld the decision of CPIO.
- V. Grounds for the Second Appeal filed on **18.06.2016**, are contained in the Memorandum of Second Appeal.

HEARING

Appellant opted to be absent despite of our due notice to him. Respondents appeared before the Commission personally and made the submissions at length.

DECISION

During hearing of the appeal, it is submitted by Shri S. Meenakshi Sundaram, Director & CPIO, that the captioned Second Appeal is based upon appellant's earlier similar RTI application dated **15.09.2015**, containing **three issues**, therein. It is further submitted by Shri S. Meenakshi Sundaram, that this Hon'ble Commission has already taken up the appellant's earlier Second Appeal based on appellant's similar RTI application dated **15.09.2015** dealt in file no. **CIC/KY/A/2016/900270** on **19.04.2016** and passed its reasoned order on the same date.

2. It is pertinent to mention here that the appellant, vide his RTI Application dated **01.05.2016**, sought information from the respondents on **four issues**. Respondents, vide their response dated **12.05.2016**, provided the required information to the appellant by stating as under:

“There is no such proposal from Ministry of Mines received by DPE.”

3. Being aggrieved by the aforesaid response, FA was filed by the appellant on **18.05.2016** before the FAA, who vide his order dated **27.05.2016**, disposed of the FA by upholding the views of CPIO.
4. The Commissioner heard the submissions made by appellant as well as respondents at length. The Commission also **perused** the case-file **thoroughly**; specifically, **nature of issues** raised by the appellant in his RTI application dated **01.05.2016**, respondent’s response dated **12.05.2016**, FAA’s order dated **27.05.2016**, other material made available on record and also the grounds of memorandum of second appeal.
5. In view of the **position** above and in the **circumstances** of the case, the Commission is of the considered view that the respondents have provided the required information to the appellant in terms of **Section 2(f) of the RTI Act 2005**. In view of this, the Commission feels that the appellant’s second appeal becomes **redundant** in this regard. Thus, the appellant’s second appeal deserves to be **dismissed**. Therefore, it is **dismissed**.
6. Apart from above, the appellant’s second appeal is also a **non-pressed**, despite of our due notice to him.

The Appeal is dismissed accordingly.

Sd/-

(M.A. Khan Yusufi)

Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(Krishan Avtar Talwar)

Deputy Secretary

The CPIO

M/o Heavy Industries & Public Enterprises,
Public Enterprises Bhawan Block No. 14,
CGO Complex, Lodi Road, New Delhi-110003

Dr. Vidyanand Thakur

08, Guest House Colony, P.O. Kotma Colliery
Dist.-Anuppur, Madhya Pradesh-484336