

**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/2016/001651**

Appellant: Mr. Prashant Kulkarni  
Building No. A-1, Flat No.-2,  
Harmony Society Nagras Road,  
Aundh, Pune-411007

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer  
Scientist 'F' & Registrar (A)  
Centre for Materials for  
Electronics Technology (C-MET)  
Deptt. Electronics & Infor. Tech.(Deity),  
HQ,SY. No-34/2B, Panchwati,  
Dr. Homi Bhabha Road,NCL (PO),  
Pune- 411008.

Date of Hearing: 25.07.2017

Dated of Decision: 25.07.2017

**ORDER**

**Facts:**

1. The appellant filed RTI application dated 26.10.2015 seeking following information: year of adoption of Modified Flexible Complementing Scheme (MFCS) in the governing council of C-MET; name of the Registrar during the period 1<sup>st</sup> May 2013 to 30<sup>th</sup> May 2015; no. of probations cleared during the aforesaid period etc.
2. The CPIO response is not on record. The appellant filed First Appeal dated 07.12.2016. The FAA response is not on record. The appellant filed second appeal on 15.06.2016 before the Commission on the ground that information should be provided to him.

**Hearing:**

3. The appellant did not participate in the hearing. The respondent participated in the hearing through video conferencing.
4. The respondent, present CPIO (Ms. Radha) stated that the appellant himself was the CPIO and while being CPIO, he had filed this RTI application.

It was his own responsibility to provide the information to himself as per his RTI application. She further stated that the appellant has since been terminated from service. Moreover, she stated that after joining as CPIO on 05.06.2017, she has sent a reply to the appellant on 20.07.2017 upon receiving this Commission's notice on 14.07.2017. The time was taken due to oversight of the RTI application as they do not have any RTI Monitoring System in their office. She informed the Commission that in a month's time they would improve the system of RTI monitoring. The reply given was read out and was found to be satisfactory.

**Discussion/ observation:**

5. There is a substantial delay in furnishing the reply. The CPIO is legally obliged to give a reply to the RTI application within 30 days. The reply given is satisfactory.

**Decision:**

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

7. The CPIO is directed to show cause, within 30 days from the date of receipt of this order, why penalty should not be imposed on her for not providing the sought for information within the timelines prescribed in the RTI Act.

8. The CPIO is further directed to improve their system of RTI monitoring and their Section 4 disclosure.

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**