

**CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**2nd Floor, 'B' Wing, August Kranti Bhawan,**  
**Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi -110066**  
**Tel : +91-11-26186535**

**Appeal Nos. CIC/YA/A/2016/002077**  
**CIC/YA/A/2016/902185**

Appellant: Sh. Mohan Lal Gupta  
641, New Millennium Apartments,  
Plot No. 2, Sector 23, Dwarka,  
New Delhi-110077.  
Delhi.

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer,  
Nuclear Power Corporation of India Ltd.,  
12-N-14, Vikram Sarabhai Bhavan,  
Anushakti Nagar, Mumbai-400094.

Date of Hearing: 03.08.2017  
Dated of Decision: 03.08.2017

**ORDER**

**Facts:**

1. The appellant filed RTI application dated 13.02.2016 seeking information on 15 points viz. details of the leave availed by Shri Alok Varshney (Emp. No. 1803964) during 01/01/2011 to 31/12/2015; details of all the LTCs/HTCs availed by Sh. Varshney during 01/01/2008 to 31/12/2015; certified copy of all the medical bills claimed by Shri Varshney during the years 2006 to 2015, as to whether Shri Varshney has furnished the Statements>Returns of Immovable property for the years 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015; if the response is 'yes' please inform as to whether all the above returns (from 2006 to 2015) submitted by Shri Varshney have since been verified/checked etc.
2. The CPIO responded on 30.03.2016. The appellant filed First Appeal dated 12.04.2016 with First Appellate Authority (FAA). The response of First Appellate Authority (FAA) is not on record. The appellant filed second appeal on 18.06.2016 and 08.07.2016 before the Commission on the ground that information should be provided to him.

**Hearing:**

3. The appellant participated in the hearing personally. The respondent Shri S.K. Srivastava, and Ms. Surbhi participated in the hearing through video conferencing,

4. The appellant stated that i) details of leave of Shri Varshney for the period 1.1.2011 to 29.7.2012 has not been provided to him. ii) out of 5 LTC claims of Shri Varshney from January, 2008 to July, 2012, only 2 were provided, whereas details of remaining 3 LTC claims of Shri Varshney has not been provided. iii) to confirm that Shri Varshney has not claimed medical bill for the period 2012 to 2015; iv) details of immovable property return of Shri Varshney for the period 2006 to 2015 have not been provided to him.

5. The respondent stated that they have provided full leave details of Shri Varshney to the appellant. The respondent further stated that they had provided documents containing 3 pages. As regards details of LTC/HTC availed by Shri Varshney, the respondent stated that they had provided all the 5 LTC claims/details of Shri Varshney. The respondent further stated that they had provided documents containing 30 pages to the appellant.

6. The respondent said that they will check their record and reconfirm to the appellant regarding details of remaining 3 LTC claimed by Shri Varshney.

7. As regards medical bill of Shri Varshney for the period 2012 to 2015, the respondent stated that they will check their record and reconfirm to the appellant.

8. With regard to details of immovable property returns of Shri Varshney, the respondent stated that as per their company's policy, they are not uploading the details of immovable property returns on their website. During the course of the hearing, the respondent cited the Hon'ble Supreme Court decision in the case of Girish Ramchandra Deshpande vs. CIC & Ors. (SLP (Civil) No. 27734 of 2012) dated 3.10.2012, which inter alia states that:

“The performance of an employee/officer in an organization is primarily a matter between the employee and the employer and normally those aspects are governed by the service rules which fall

under the expression “personal information”, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest. On the other hand, the disclosure of which would cause unwarranted invasion of privacy of that individual. Of course, in a given case, if the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer of the Appellate Authority is satisfied that the larger public interest justified the disclosure of such information appropriate orders could be passed but the petitioner cannot claim those details as a matter of right.”

**Discussion/ observation:**

9. The respondent should provide information to the appellant as per paras 6 and 7 above, within 15 days of receipt of this order.

10. As regards details of immovable property returns of Shri Varshney, the Commission observed that the same cannot be provided in view of Hon’ble Supreme Court’s decision dated 3.10.2012, referred to in para 8 above.

**Decision:**

11. The respondent is directed to take action as per para 9.

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**