

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

Appeal No.CIC/BS/A/2015/002097

Appellant: Kamlesh Chand Dewan
H. No. 59, Ward No. 6, Gandhi Nagar,
Hamirpur, Himachal Pradesh-177001.

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer
AGM (Admin), BSNL, O/o GMTD,
Hamirpur, Himachal Pradesh-177001.

Date of Hearing: 03.03.2017
Date of Decision: 03.03.2017

ORDER

Facts:

1. The appellant filed RTI application dated 13.08.2015 seeking information on 2 points viz (i) about contact details of Legal Authority constituted to look into the complaints of BSNL customers of Hamirpur District and (ii) action taken on his complaint to JTO, SDE, G.M., Hamirpur regarding his BSNL landline no. 222800 which was not functional for long time.

2. The CPIO responded on 31.08.2015, providing contact details of the authority concerned for redressal of the aforesaid grievances. The appellant filed first appeal dated 11.09.2015 before the first appellate authority (FAA). The FAA responded on 28.09.2015. The appellant filed second appeal to the Commission on 27.11.2015 on the ground that information should be provided to him.

Hearing:

3. The appellant participated in the hearing. The respondent did not participate in the hearing.

4. The appellant referred to his RTI application dated 13.08.2015 and stated that his landline telephone no.222800 installed in Hamirpur City was out of order for six months. A complaint regarding this had been made repeatedly to respondent but no action had been taken to make his telephone functional. The respondent stated that having failed to get relief he met the respondent to enquire as to which legal authority of Telecom Department he can approach against them. The appellant stated that he was told that Telecom Department have their own Courts for dispute redressal.

5. The appellant stated that for information on respondent's legal authority, he had moved this RTI application. The appellant stated that he has been provided misleading information. He has been harassed. The appellant stated that after order of the Consumer Court, his telephone was restored to order. The appellant stated that a penalty and cost should be imposed upon the respondent for giving misleading information and harassing him.

Discussion/ observation:

6. From the perusal of the reply given to the appellant vide letter dated 31.08.2015, it is observed that the desired information has not been provided to the appellant.

Decision:

7. The respondent is directed to provide the name of their own legal authority (on the lines of Consumer Dispute Redressal Forum) if any, to whom appellant could move for legal remedy as stated in his RTI application, within 15 days of this order.

8. The respondent is directed to showcause why action should not be taken against him for contravening the provisions of the RTI Act, including not attending the hearing within 30 days of this order.

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