

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
August Kranti Bhawan, Bhikaji Cama Place,
New Delhi-110066

F. No. **CIC/SA/A/2016/001666**

Date of Hearing : 05.09.2017
Date of Decision : 05.09.2017
Appellant/Complainant : S.K. Shrivastava
Respondent : PIO, O/o the Sub Divisional
Magistrate- (HQ) ,
(Government of NCT of Delhi), New
Delhi
Through: None

Information Commissioner : Shri Yashovardhan Azad

Relevant facts emerging from appeal:

RTI application filed on : 04-11-2016
PIO replied on : 02-12-2016
First Appeal filed on : 28.12.2016
First Appellate Order on : 16-02-2016
2nd Appeal/complaint filed on : 10-06-2016

Information sought and background of the case:

Vide RTI application dated 04-11-2016, the appellant sought following information about Institution of Valuer (Society), Pitampura:

- a) *Provision for copy of byelaws & elections procedures amended 11 April 2015 & November 2015 by IOV.*
- b) *Approved area of operation/jurisdiction of IOV.*
- c) *Provision for copy of account statements of IOV from 2010-2015 till date (balance sheet)*

The CPIO replied on 02.12.2015 as follows:

“District wise society registration work started in the District (NW). Kanjhawala, Delhi – 81 w.e.f. May, 2010. Prior to this, it was being dealt by the Registrar of Society, Industries Department, Patparganj, Delhi and now being transferred to the concerned districts.

As per record, this society i.e. Institution of Valuers (Registration No. 3860/68) having its office at 3, Parwana Road, adjacent to Balbharti School, Pitampura, Delhi-34 is not registered in the District (NW).

Moreover, handing over of society registration record from Industries Department is under process and desired information regarding this society can be given only after proper handing over the record.”

The appellant filed 1st appeal on 28.12.2015 on the grounds that no concrete reply was given by PIO. The First Appellate Authority vide order dated 16.02.2016 presumed satisfaction of appellant as the appellant abstained from attending hearing on two occasions. Dissatisfied with the FAO, the appellant approached Commission.

Relevant facts emerging during hearings:

The appellant was absent during the hearing today before the Commission in the similar way as he was absent during hearing of the First Appeal. The Respondent has also chosen to remain absent today.

Decision:

Perusal of records reveal that PIO has already responded to the query of the appellant. Since none has appeared for the hearing, on behalf of either party, there appears no reason to adjudicate the matter at hand.

The appeal is disposed of.

(Yashovardhan Azad)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy. Additional copies of orders shall be supplied against application and payment of the charges prescribed under the Act to the CPIO of this Commission.

(R.P.Grover)
Designated Officer