

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
2nd Floor, 'B' Wing, August Kranti Bhawan,
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi -110066
Tel : +91-11-26717355

Appeal No. CIC/RK/A/2016/001354

Appellant: Shanker Singh
A-219, Krishna Market, Shyam Vihar, Phase-I,
Najafgarh, New Delhi-110043

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer
Addl. Registrar Supreme Court of India Tilak Marg,
New Delhi 110001

Date of Hearing: 06.12.2016

Dated of Decision: 06.12.2016

ORDER

Facts:

1. The appellant filed RTI application dated 12.01.2016 seeking information regarding SLP (C) No. 23820 of 2015 including authenticated order/OM/notification issued by the Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Expenditure regarding revision of pay scale of Rs. 1400-2300 to 4500-7000 for Draughtsman etc.

2. The CPIO responded on 01.02.2016. The appellant filed first appeal on 04.03.2016 with the First Appellate Authority (FAA). The FAA responded on 29.03.2016. The appellant filed appeal on 07.06.2016 before the Commission with the plea that the sought for information has not been provided to him.

Hearing:

3. The appellant and the respondent both participated in the hearing.

5. The appellant stated that his SLP was summarily dismissed by the Supreme Court. The appellant stated that he wanted to know the basis on which the scale of Rs.4500/- was fixed by his department for retirement benefits.

6. The respondent stated that the appellant has been replied to vide letter dated 01.02.2016 that his SLP (C) No. 23820/2015 was dismissed on 09.10.2015. The respondent stated that it is beyond the jurisdiction and scope of the duties of the CPIO under the RTI Act to interpret the law, judgements/order of the Court, to give explanation, opine, comment or advise on matters etc. The respondent stated that the appellant further informed that he may obtain copy of the judicial record on payment of prescribed fee as per Supreme Court Rules 2013 which is available on Supreme Court website www.sci.nic.in.

7. The respondent stated that the first appellate authority vide its order dated 29.03.2016 had disposed of the first appeal having concurred with the findings of the CPIO.

Discussion/ observation:

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

Decision:

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

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