

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

Club building, Opposite Ber Sarai Market, Old JNU Campus, New Delhi- 110067.

Tel: 011 - 26182593/26182594

Email: registrycab@gmail.com

File No : CIC/RM/A/2014/001957

In the matter of:

Shri C K Rajappan
Junior Engineer (Civil) Retd.
Chettukattil (House), Konthuruthy,
Thevera Post Kochi-682013

...Appellant

Vs.

Central Public information Officer
M/o Defence, CDA Chennai, No. 618
Anna Salai Teynampet,
Chennai-600018
Ref No. CDA Chennai/RTI/12-13/Regn No.17

..Respondent

	Dates
RTI application	: 09.11.2013
CPIO reply	: 25.11.2013&22.01.2014
First Appeal	: 03.12.2013
FAA Order	: Not on record
Second Appeal dated	: 17.03.2014
Date of hearing	: 26.08.2016

Information sought:

The appellant had sought pay drawn details for the period August 1999 to January 2003.

Grounds for Second Appeal

The CPIO did not provide the desired information.

Order

Appellant : **Absent**
Respondent : **CPIO, Shri, Sumit, Dy. Controller of Accounts**

During the hearing it is submitted by the respondent CPIO that CPIO had replied twice, vide letter dated 25.11.13 and 22.01.14 to the appellant. In the first reply, the then CPIO stated that the entire information has been destroyed as there were more than six years old and in the second reply, the CPIO claimed that the CPIO provided the information for the months of June & December from 1999 to 2003.

When the present CPIO was asked the reason for this prima facie contradiction in the two replies sent to the appellant, the CPIO clarified that the second reply dated 22.01.14 was issued after the order of the FAA who had drawn the attention of the CPIO to the provisions contained in the Office Manual of part II Volume I which stated that pay details of the months of June & December of any year are to be kept preserved for 35 years & not 6 years as communicated to the appellant in the first reply, that is why the reply had been changed.

The appellant was not present to challenge the contention of the respondent PIO.

On being asked why the CPIO could not take into account this fact while giving reply on 25.11.2013 itself (1st reply), the CPIO could not offer a satisfactory reason. The then CPIO who had provided the apparently contradictory replies should be cautioned to be more careful in future. **A copy of the order shall be sent to the PCDA for taking suitable action against the defaulting officer.**

On perusal of the case record, it is seen that the reply dated 22.01.14 was also not complete as no details had been provided to the appellant. The present CPIO shall provide copies of pay bills even for those regarding which details were provided in the second reply dated 22.01.2014 by the respondent.

The respondent CPIO is directed to provide copy of such documents as mentioned in the order to the appellant within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of the order. The information shall be provided free of cost as the furnishing of the said information has been badly delayed.

With the above direction, the appeal is disposed of.

[Amitava Bhattacharyya]
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(A.K.Talapatra)
Dy. Registrar