

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/2016/001243

Appellant : Shri Himanshu Thakur
103-F, Aram Bagh, Paharganj, Delhi

Public Authority : The PIO & Sr. R.O. (RTI)
DDA, Vikas Sadan, INA
New Delhi-110023

Date of Hearing : 29.09.2016

Date of Decision : 29.09.2016

Presence:

Appellant : Shri Himanshu Thakur
PIO : Absent

FACTS:

- I. Vide RTI application dated **07.03.2016**, the Appellant sought information on **5 issues**.
- II. PIO, vide its response dated **23.09.2016**, allegedly provided the part required information to the appellant.
- III. The First Appeal (FA) was filed on **NIL**, as desired information not provided.
- IV. First Appellate Authority (FAA), order is not on record.
- V. Grounds for the Second Appeal filed on **26.06.2016**, are contained in the Memorandum of Second Appeal.

HEARING

Appellant appeared before the Commission personally and made the submissions at length. However, Sh. Brijesh Kumar, AEE (C), appeared before the Commission without any authorization from the competent authority therefore he was not permitted.

DECISION

It would be seen here that the appellant, vide his RTI Application dated **07.03.2016**, sought information from the respondents on **5 issues**. Respondents, vide their response dated **23.09.2016**, allegedly provided the part required information to the appellant. Being aggrieved by the aforesaid response, appellant filed his FA on **NIL** 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. On careful perusal of the nature of issues as raised by the appellant in his RTI application dated **07.03.2016** and respondent's response dated **23.09.2016 (at belated stage)**, it is

revealed to the Commission that the respondents have provided the required information against **issues no. 1 & 2**. However, respondents have provided the **vague & incorrect** information, against **issues no. 3, 4 & 5**, to the appellant.

3. The Commissioner heard the submissions made by appellant respondents at length. The Commission also **perused** the case-file **thoroughly**; specifically, **nature of issues** raised by the appellant in his RTI application dated **07.03.2016**, respondent's response dated **23.09.2016**, other material made available on record and also the grounds of memorandum of second appeal.
4. The Commission is of the considered view that the appellant has been **deprived** by the respondents **deliberately** from having the benefits of the RTI Act 2005, **even after lapse of more than six months period**. Thus, the respondents **have defeated the very purpose** of the RTI Act 2005 for which it was legislated by Parliament of India. As such, the Commission feels that appellant's second appeal deserves to be **allowed partly** i.e. against **issues no. 3, 4 & 5**. Therefore, it is **allowed accordingly**.
5. In view of the above, the respondents are hereby directed to provide the **complete & categorical** information, **against issues no. 3, 4 & 5**, to the appellant as per his RTI application, **in accordance with the provisions of RTI Act 2005**, within 30 days from the date of receipt of this order under intimation to this Commission. **If need be, Section 5(4) of the RTI Act 2005 may also be invoked in the matter.**

The Appeal is disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-

(M.A. Khan Yusufi)

Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(Krishan Avtar Talwar)

Deputy Secretary

The PIO & Sr. R.O. (RTI)

DDA, Vikas Sadan, INA

New Delhi-110023

Shri Himanshu Thakur

103-F, Aram Bagh,

Paharganj, Delhi