

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/2016/001190

Appellant : Shri Ram Kumar Kapur
A-73, Avenue-1, Saket, Near PVR
New Delhi-110017

Public Authority : The Dy. Director (CL) & PIO
DDA, Commercial Establishments
A-Block, 2nd Floor, VikasSadan, INA
New Delhi-110023

Date of Hearing : 22.09.2016
Date of Decision : 22.09.2016

Presence:

Appellant : Shri Ram Kumar Kapur
PIO : Absent

FACTS:

- I. Vide RTI application dated **19.11.2015**, the Appellant sought information on **5 issues**.
- II. PIO, response is not on record.
- III. The First Appeal (FA) was filed on **06.04.2016**, as desired information not provided.
- IV. First Appellate Authority (FAA), order is not on record.
- V. Grounds for the Second Appeal filed on **01.07.2016**, are contained in the Memorandum of Second Appeal.

HEARING

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

DECISION

It would be seen here that the appellant, vide his RTI Application dated **19.11.2015**, sought information from the DDA/respondents on **5 issues**. However, respondents **failed to furnish** any response to the appellant. Being aggrieved with the aforesaid PIO's **inaction**, appellant filed his FA on **06.04.2016** before FAA, who **could not take up** the same for its disposal **for the reasons best known to him**. Hence, a Second Appeal before this Commission.

2. During hearing of the appeal, it is revealed to the Commission that property bearing no. 16-18 (Vardhman Tower), Preet Vihar Commercial Centre, Preet Vihar, Vikas Marg, Delhi

110092, owned by some private builder who, might have acquired from DDA on the basis of lease agreement, Sale agreement etc. On this, the Commission posed a query to Appellant, as to prove the locus-standi between him and DDA. On this, very aspect, Shri Ram Kumar Kapur, Appellant, failed to do so and kept on arguing illogically on irrelevant issues. Not only this, the appellant was failed to made the Builder as a party in the matter, so that the link between Builder and DDA be made clear. In view of this, the Commission feels that appellant failed to established link/locus-standi between him and DDA.

3. The Commissioner heard the submissions made by appellant at length. The Commission also **perused** the case-file **thoroughly**; specifically, **nature of issues** raised by the appellant in his RTI application dated **19.11.2015**, other material made available on record including appellant's written submissions dated **16.09.2016** and also the grounds of memorandum of second appeal.
4. By virtue of **position** above and in the **circumstances** of the case, the Commission finds that appellant failed to established link/locus-standi between him and DDA. 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**.

The Appeal is dismissed accordingly.

Sd/-

(M.A. Khan Yusufi)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(Krishan Avtar Talwar)
Deputy Secretary

The Dy. Director (CL) & PIO
DDA, Commercial Establishments
A-Block, 2nd Floor, Vikas Sadan, INA
New Delhi-110023

Shri Ram Kumar Kapur
A-73, Avenue-1, Saket, Near PVR
New Delhi-110017