

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/2016/001210

Appellant : Mr. Gula Bheemi Reddy
17 (Old No. 14) Golden Avenue
Vijayanagar, Velachery, Chennai-600042

Public Authority : The Secretary & CPIO
Ministry of Commerce,
Indian Institute of Packaging
Head Office: Plot No. E-2, Road No. 8
MIDC Area, Andheri (East), Mumbai-400093

Date of Hearing : 23.09.2016

Date of Decision : 23.09.2016

Presence:

Appellant : Absent

CPIO : Absent

FACTS:

- I. Vide RTI application dated **11.01.2016**, the Appellant sought information on **11 issues**.
- II. CPIO, vide its response dated **05.02.2016, 06.04.2016, 08.04.2016 & 06.05.2016**, has provided the part information to the Appellant and allowed for the inspection.
- III. The First Appeal (FA) was filed on **12.04.2016**, as desired information not provided.
- IV. First Appellate Authority (FAA), vide its order dated **18.05.2016**, upheld the decision of CPIO.
- V. Grounds for the Second Appeal filed on **05.07.2016**, are contained in the Memorandum of Second Appeal.

HEARING

Appellant as well as respondent opted to be absent despite of our due notice to them.

DECISION

It is pertinent to mention here that the appellant, vide his RTI Application dated **11.01.2016**, sought information from the respondents on **11 issues**. Respondents, vide their response dated **05.02.2016, 06.04.2016, 08.04.2016 & 06.05.2016**, provided the required information to the appellant. Being aggrieved by the aforesaid response, FA was

filed by the appellant on **12.04.2016** before the FAA, who vide his order dated **18.05.2016**, disposed of the FA by upholding the views of CPIO.

2. The Commissioner **perused** the case-file **thoroughly**; specifically, **nature of issues** raised by the appellant in his RTI application dated **11.01.2016**, respondent's response dated **05.02.2016, 06.04.2016, 08.04.2016 & 06.05.2016**, FAA's order dated **18.05.2016**, other material made available on record and also the grounds of memorandum of second appeal.
3. 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**.

The Appeal is disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-

(M.A. Khan Yusufi)

Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(Krishan Avtar Talwar)

Deputy Secretary

The Secretary &CPIO

Ministry of Commerce,

Indian Institute of Packaging

Head Office: Plot No. E-2, Road No. 8

MIDC Area, Andheri (East), Mumbai-400093

Mr. Gula Bheemi Reddy

17 (Old No. 14) Golden Avenue

Vijayanagar, Velachery, Chennai-600042