

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

August Kranti Bhawan, Bhikaji Cama Place,
New Delhi-110066

F. No. CIC/SA/A/2016/001870

Date of Hearing : 18.08.2017
Date of Decision : 18.08.2017
Appellant/Complainant : Mr. Sunil Kumar
Respondent : PIO, O/o Distt. & Session Judge
Through:- Suarabh Shukla, Suman
Kalra, Usha Arora
Information Commissioner : **Shri Yashovardhan Azad**

Relevant facts emerging from appeal:

RTI application filed on : 11.02.2016
PIO replied on : 27.02.2016
First Appeal filed on : 22.03.2016
First Appellate Order on : 20.05.2016
2nd Appeal/complaint received on : 22.07.2016

Information sought and background of the case:

Vide RTI application dated 11.02.2016, the appellant, aggrieved due to error in fixation of his salary, sought the following:

- 1. Information in writing regarding action taken on all representation filed by the appellant.*
- 2. Information regarding name and designation of the officials who have been dealing with his representation*
- 3. Copy of computation sheet of his salary*
- 4. Reasons as to why no action has been taken by the department besides seeking redressal of grievance in writing on 03 occasions.*

CPIO vide letter dated 27.02.2016 informed the appellant that as per input received from the Sr.AO(J), O/o the Ld. ACJ, Central, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi, the representation moved by him complying section 9 (XIII) of DDC(RTI)Rules-2008 is pending consideration and in view of the same, the RTI Act, 2005 is not supposed to be invoked. Being dissatisfied, the appellant filed an appeal on 22.03.2016. In the meantime, Sr. Administrative Officer (Judicial), O/o Administrative Civil Judge Office (Central) informed the appellant that some anomaly had arisen while fixing

his pay, the process to scrutinize his pay is under process and the same will be rectified.

The FAA vide order dated 20.05.2016 directed the appellant to approach the concerned authority in view of Rule 9(xiii) of the Delhi District Courts (Right to Information) Rules, 2008. In the 2nd appeal, the appellant submitted that he personally visited the concerned accounts branch, but neither dealing official nor any supervisory authority considered his representation. Feeling aggrieved, the appellant approached the Commission.

Relevant facts emerging during hearing:

Both parties are present for hearing and appellant reiterates that on account of discrepancy of Rs. 25/- in his pay he had to approach the Commission. However, appellant submits that upon taking recourse of RTI Act, his grievance has now been redressed.

Decision:

After hearing parties and perusal of record, the Commission notes that appellant has expressed satisfaction with the redressal of his grievance and accordingly any further proceeding in this case is dispensed with.

The appeal is thus 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

Copy to:-

SUNIL KUMAR C/o. Shri Pankaj Gupta, ASJ Room No.-409, Rohini Courts, Delhi-110085.	Public Information Officer under RTI, Ms. Usha Arora - PIO, O/o. the District & Session Judge- (HQ), Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi- 110054.
First Appellate Authority under RTI Ms. Poonam Chaudhry - FAA-Central, Ld. Special Judge- (ACB), O/o. the District & Session Judge-Delhi, Tis Hazari Courts, Room No.-25, Delhi- 110054.	

