

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
2nd Floor, 'B' Wing, August Kranti Bhawan,
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi -110066
Tel : +91-11-26186535

Appeal No. CIC/BS/A/2016/001294

Appellant: Rajinibala,
House No. 192, Gaurav Vihar Colony,
Near Rama Degree College, Chinhat,
Lucknow-226028, U.P.

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer
Dir. (SEA), Deptt. of Telecom,
Room No. 904, Sanchar Bhawan,
20, Ashoka Road, New Delhi-110001.

Date of Hearing: 15.06.2017

Dated of Decision: 15.06.2017

ORDER

Facts:

1. The appellant filed RTI application dated 07.10.2015 seeking information on 9 points regarding absorption of Junior Accountants, Senior Accountants, LDC etc. along with the related Rules of absorption, pay fixation, transition from IDA scale to CDA scale etc.

2. The CPIO responded on 12.11.2015. The appellant filed first appeal dated 29.12.2015. The FAA responded on 00.02.2016. The appellant filed second appeal on 19.04.2016 before the Commission on the ground that information should be provided to her.

Hearing:

3. The appellant participated in the hearing represented by her husband Mr. Nandlal Prasad through video conferencing. The respondent participated in the hearing in person.

4. The appellant stated that the respondent should provide him the sought for information. Further, he (Mr. Prasad) leveled accusations against the respondent with regard to wrong settlement of his MACP issues.

5. The respondent stated that the sought for information is in the form of a query which does not come within the definition of 'information' u/section 2(f) of the RTI Act. Further, they stated that his grievance has also been redressed after taking up the matter with the DoPT.

Discussion/ observation:

6. The action/steps taken by the respondent in dealing with the RTI application is satisfactory.

7. The Commission observed that Shri Prasad got this RTI relating to his own service matter filed by his wife and later on turned up himself before the Commission to represent his own case. The Commission further observed that in this RTI application, he has asked for opinions and not information.

Decision:

8. No further intervention of the Commission is required in the matter.

9. The appellant's husband Mr. Nandlal Prasad is hereby admonished for filing an RTI application in the name of his wife and then presenting his case himself as his wife's representative.

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