

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

File No. CIC/RK/A/2016/001322/KY

Appellant : Shri S. P. Zavar
Roohan Garden Society
Flat No. F-4, Near Bhajbal Township
Kothrud, Pune-411038

Public Authority : The CPIO
Dy. Official Liquidator High Court Bombay,
5th Floor, Bank of India Building, MG Road, Fort, Mumbai-400023

Date of Hearing : 20.09.2016
Date of Decision : 20.09.2016

Presence:

Appellant : Absent
CPIO : Absent

FACTS:

- I. Vide RTI application dated **19.10.2015**, the Appellant sought information on **sole issue**.
- II. CPIO, vide its response dated **18.11.2015**, has reportedly provided the information to the Appellant.
- III. The First Appeal (FA) was filed on **30.11.2015**, as desired information not provided.
- IV. First Appellate Authority (FAA), vide its order dated **29.12.2015**, upheld the decision of CPIO.
- V. Grounds for the Second Appeal filed on **25.04.2016**, 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 **19.10.2015**, sought information from the respondents on **sole issue**. Respondents, vide their response dated **18.11.2015**, provided the required information to the appellant. Being aggrieved by the aforesaid response, FA was filed by the appellant on **30.11.2015** before

the FAA, who vide his order dated **29.12.2015**, disposed of the FA by upholding the views of CPIO.

2. The Commissioner **perused** the case-file **thoroughly**; specifically, **nature of issue** raised by the appellant in his RTI application dated **19.10.2015**, respondent's response dated **18.11.2015**, FAA's order dated **29.12.2015**, 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 dismissed accordingly.

Sd/-

(M.A. Khan Yusufi)

Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(Krishan Avtar Talwar)

Deputy Secretary

The CPIO

Dy. Official Liquidator High Court Bombay,
5th Floor, Bank of India Building,
MG Road, Fort, Mumbai-400023

Shri S. P. Zavar

Roohan Garden Society

Flat No. F-4, Near Bhajbal Township

Kothrud, Pune-411038