

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/2016/001365

Appellant: Vinod Kumar Anand
27 DSIDC Complex, Mata Sundri Road, New Delhi
110002.

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 03.12.2015 seeking information regarding number of SLPs filed from 2010 onwards and number of SLP admitted/notice issued, number of SLPs represented by Senior Counsel etc.

2. The CPIO responded on 07.01.2016. The appellant filed first appeal on 28.01.2016 with the First Appellate Authority (FAA). The FAA responded on 15.02.2016. The appellant filed appeal on 09.06.2016 before the Commission with the plea that the sought for information has not been provided to him.

Hearing:

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

4. The appellant stated that he has not been provided complete information.

5. The respondent stated that the appellant has been replied to vide letter dated 07.01.2016 that as could be retrieved from the system, SLP (C) and SLP (CrI.) filed/instituted w.e.f. 2011 to 2015 is 101300 and 38532

respectively. The respondent stated that segregation of admitted SLPs and notices issued in such cases is not generated as per the structure maintained in the system. The respondent stated that in some of the cases SLPs later on converted into Civil Appeal and in some of cases statutory Civil Appeal is filed in the Supreme Court. The respondent stated that the data regarding appearance of senior advocate in the SLPs is not readily available.

6. The respondent stated that the first appellate authority vide its order dated 15.02.2016 had disposed of the first appeal having concurred with the findings of the CPIO.

Discussion/ observation:

7. The action/steps taken by the respondent in dealing with the RTI application is satisfactory. The available information has been provided the appellant.

Decision:

8. 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