

# CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

File No. **CIC/KY/A/2016/001288**

Appellant : Shri Amin Chand  
H. No. 204, Sector-46 A  
UT Chandigarh

Public Authority : The Executive Engineer cum CPIO  
Chandigarh Municipal Corporation  
MCPH Division No. 4, New Deluxe Building,  
Jan Marg, Sec-17, UT Chandigarh-160017

Date of Hearing : 06.10.2016  
Date of Decision : 06.10.2016

## Presence:

Appellant : Absent  
CPIO : Shri Aarish Kumar Saini, Executive Engineer & CPIO

## FACTS:

- I. Vide RTI application dated **NIL**, the Appellant sought information on **9 issues**.
- II. CPIO, vide its response dated **01.02.2016, 09.02.2016**, has provided the part information to the Appellant.
- III. The First Appeal (FA) was filed on **03.02.2016, 31.03.2016**, as desired information not provided.
- IV. First Appellate Authority (FAA), vide its order dated **10.03.2016**, directed CPIO to provide the information to the Appellant.
- V. Grounds for the Second Appeal filed on **23.07.2016**, 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

At the outset, it is to be seen here that the captioned Second Appeal is based upon appellant's earlier RTI application dated **NIL**. It is further to be seen here that this Hon. Commission has already taken up the appellant's earlier Second Appeal based on appellant's RTI application dated **NIL** dealt in file no. **CIC/KY/A/2016/000990** on **09.08.2016** and passed it's speaking order on the same date.

2. The Commission has perused the nature of the issues as contained in appellant's present RTI application dated **NIL** and appellant's earlier RTI application of same date and finds that both RTI applications are same. Not only this, the reply provided by the respondents, vide their same responses i.e. dated **01.02.2016**, **09.02.2016** and orders passed by the learned FAA on **10.03.2016** in both FA filed by the appellant, are also same.
3. In view of the **position** above and in the **circumstances** of case, the Commission feels that it would be **appropriate and even justified** to dispose of the appellant's captioned second appeal in terms of its earlier order dated **09.08.2016** passed in the appellant's earlier second appeal based on appellant's same RTI application dated **NIL**. Thus, the appellant's instant second appeal is hereby disposed of in terms of Hon. CIC's earlier order dated **09.08.2016** passed in **file no. CIC/KY/A/2016/000990**.

The Appeal is disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-

(M.A. Khan Yusufi)

Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(Krishan Avtar Talwar)

Deputy Secretary

The Executive Engineer cum CPIO  
Chandigarh Municipal Corporation  
MCPH Division No. 4, New Deluxe Building,  
Jan Marg, Sec-17, UT Chandigarh-160017

Shri Amin Chand

H. No. 204, Sector-46 A

UT Chandigarh