

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
2nd Floor, 'B' Wing, August Kranti Bhawan
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066

Tel: +91-11-26186535

Appeal No.CIC/KY/A/2016/001206

Appellant: Virender Singh Yadav
B-503, Subham Appts., Plot No. -13,
Sector-22, Dwarka, New Delhi-77.

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer
RPO, M/o External Affairs,
HUDCO Trikoot-III, Bhikaji Cama Place,
R.K. Puram, New Delhi-110066.

Date of Hearing: 08.03.2017

Date of Decision: 08.03.2017

ORDER

Facts:

1. The appellant filed RTI application dated 23.03.2016 seeking information on five points regarding maintenance of record of passports with regard to (i) Penalties paid by individuals on account of holding more than one passport, particularly of 2003, (ii) Whether record of penalties are month/year wise and whether, these records are in the physical form or on CD (iii) Whether there's any record of individual violators of Passport Act by name/address/casewise, (iv) Whether record of impounded/cancelled/revoked passports is being maintained by passport numbers/names or if so in what form, (v) Whether there's any record of 2003 pertaining to forwarded passports in case of violation of the passport code.
2. The CPIO responded on 25.04.2016 by giving a point wise reply. The appellant filed first appeal dated 10.05.2016 before the first appellate

authority (FAA). The FAA responded on 14.07.2016. The appellant filed complaint to the Commission on 03.08.2016 on the ground that information should be provided to him.

Hearing:

3. The respondent and the respondent participated in the hearing through counsel in person.

4. The appellant stated that the sought for information has not been provided to him. The appellant stated that he should be provided pointwise reply to his RTI application.

5. The respondent stated that the appellant has been replied to vide letter dated 25.04.2016. The respondent stated that penalty related information is not available in the computer system in compiled form. The respondent stated physical record is available in the applicant's individual files. The respondent stated that they will give pointwise reply to the appellant.

Discussion/ observation:

6. The Commission observed that the point wise reply has not been given to the appellant and given reply is vague/misleading/false and not correct.

Decision:

7. Respondent is directed to give a revised reply to the appellant in context of his RTI application within 30 days of this order.

8. Respondent CPIO is directed to showcause why action should not be taken against them for contravening the provisions of the RTI Act including not giving correct information, within 30 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