

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/2014/002004

In the matter of:

Major L S Shekhawat (Retd)
House No-12, Chand Bihari Nagar
Khatipura, Jaipur (Raj)-302012

...Appellant

Vs.

Central Public information Officer
M/o Defence, IHQ (Army)
Additional Director General of Army
Education, DHQ, RTI Cell, ADG MT (AE)
G-6, D-1 Wing Sena Bhawan, Gate No. 4,
New Delhi-110011

..Respondent

	Dates
RTI application	: 16.09.2013
CPIO reply	: 30.10.2013 & 22.01.2014
First Appeal	: 12.12.2013
FAA Order	: Not on record
Second Appeal	: 21.02.2014
Date of hearing	: 30.08.2016

Information sought:

The appellant had sought his leave details from 1986 to 1995 and details of the CPIO and FAA.

Grounds for Second Appeal

The CPIO did not provide the desired information.

Order

Appellant : **Absent**
Respondent : **CPIO, Brig. Samar Vir Singh**

During the hearing it is seen that the information under the RTI Act was provided in January, 2014. It is seen that the date of RTI application has not been mentioned by the RTI applicant in his application. The respondent CPIO submitted that all information has been furnished and the case hence may be considered for closure.

On perusal of the case record, it is seen that date has not been mentioned in the RTI application. In the second appeal memo the appellant had complained against delay in providing information i.e. delay of about four months. The CPIO submitted during the hearing that providing of information took some time as the information sought for is scattered in various files. It appears that the entire information was provided in January 14. However, the appellant also submitted in the second appeal memo to provide some additional information which was not mentioned in the original RTI application. Such additional information can not be asked for in the appeal memo submitted to the CIC. In case additional information is required, a separate RTI application is to be submitted for this purpose.

In the present case the entire information was provided to the appellant in time. The appellant was not present to challenge the contention of the respondent PIO.

The Commission finds it a fit case for closure.

The matter stands closed.

[Amitava Bhattacharyya]
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(A.K.Talapatra)
Dy. Registrar

