

**CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
August Kranti Bhawan, Bhikaji Cama Place,  
New Delhi-110066

F. No.CIC/YA/A/2016/002297

Date of Hearing : **10.10.2017**  
Date of Decision : **16.10.2017**  
Appellant/Complainant : **M.Bala Soudarssanane**  
Respondent : **PIO/JIPMER, Puducherry**  
**Information Commissioner : Shri Yashovardhan Azad**

**Relevant facts emerging from appeal:**

RTI application filed on : 30.11.2015  
PIO replied on : 04.12.2015  
First Appeal filed on : 08.12.2015  
First Appellate Order on : 06.01.2016  
2<sup>nd</sup> Appeal/complaint received on : 18.01.2016

**Information sought and background of the case:**

Vide RTI application dated 30.11.2015; the appellant sought the following information u/s 7(1) of RTI Act:

1. *Copy of specific Govt./Institute rules that sanction the above circumstances (a) only President and Director sign minutes of GB/IB and (b) the remaining members only approve the minutes in next session which is usually 6 months later. Even here, minutes on approval are signed only by those two. In effect, none of the other members sign any minute at all.*
2. *Copy of Govt./institute rules sanctioning implementation of GB/IB decisions by President and Director without waiting for approval in next session. In fact they implemented compulsory retirement within a day, before approval.*
3. *Copy of Govt. /institute rules under which they signed GB May 2012 minutes undated.*
4. *Copy of file-notes/documents putting up GB May, 2012 for initial draft approval and for final signatures by Director and President as well as copy of file /notes /documents putting up my compulsory retirement order for initial draft approval by Director.*

5. *Copy of rules that it is or that it is not mandatory, under office procedures, that file note(s) approvals are a must to include items and supporting papers for the agenda, and*
6. *Copy of rules that the President and Director can decide these unilaterally and arbitrarily.*

PIO vide letter dated 04.12.2016 informed the appellant that the information sought does not, in any way, affect the life and liberty of the individual and hence does not warrant the same to be provided to him within 48 hours. Being dissatisfied the appellant filed an appeal. The FAA vide order dated 06.01.2016 upheld the decision of PIO.

**Relevant facts emerging during hearing:**

Both the parties are present and heard. At the outset the appellant states that an identical appeal seeking similar information to the one in hand was adjudicated by the Commission in CIC/YA/A/2014/001816. He states that the PIO did not furnish the information as directed in the aforesaid decision. Per contra, the PIO states that the appellant has already inspected the complete records on 11.12.2015 and had signed a statement to that effect also. After deliberations, it emerges that the appellant was working with JIPMER and was compulsorily retired following an ex-parte enquiry. The appellant states that management of the institution has inflicted the said penalty following the spirit of retribution as he had made certain complaints with respect to the wrong doings of the management. The appellant asserts that information may be furnished to him to fortify his ongoing court case.

**Decision:**

After hearing parties and perusal of record, the Commission directs the PIO to furnish complete information afresh within two weeks of receipt of this order.

The appeal is allowed in aforesaid terms.

**(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:-


