

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

F. No. **CIC/YA/C/2016/000059**  
**CIC/YA/C/2016/000060**  
**CIC/YA/C/2016/000061**

Date of Hearing : **10.08.2016**  
Date of Decision : **01.09.2016**

Appellant/Complainant : **Shri B Bharathi, Puducherry**

Respondent : CPIO, Dept. of Personnel &  
Administrative Reforms, Puducherry

Through:  
Shri Selvaraj, PIO/Suptd.

**Information Commissioner : Shri Yashovardhan Azad**

**Since both the parties are same in the above mentioned appeals, these appeals are clubbed together for hearing and disposal to avoid multiplicity of the proceedings.**

**Relevant facts emerging from appeal:**

Case No.	RTI filed no.	CPIO reply	First appeal filed	FAA order	2 <sup>nd</sup> appeal filed on
0059	09.11.2015	15.12.2015	23.12.2015	No order passed	18.03.2016
0060	09.11.2015	15.12.2015	23.12.2015	No order passed	18.03.2016
0061	09.11.2015	15.12.2015	23.12.2015	No order passed	18.03.2016

**CIC/YA/C/2016/000059**

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

The complainant vide RTI application dated 09.11.2015 sought information under 7 points regarding the approval of additional charge given for the post of Director of Higher and Technical Education Puducherry to Mrs. Priyadharshini, a Puducherry Civil Service officer who was holding the post of Registrar of Co-operative societies in February – March 2013. CPIO replied on

15.12.2015 thereby denying the information in absence of exact file number. The appellant preferred first appeal but the same remained unheard. Feeling aggrieved the complainant approached the Commission.

**Relevant facts emerging during hearing:**

The complainant is absent despite notice. The respondent is present and heard. The CPIO states that the on 27.01.2016, in compliance of the FAO all the information has been furnished to the complainant. The views of complainant could not be ascertained.

**Decision:**

After hearing the respondent and perusal of record, the Commission finds no reason to disbelieve the version of CPIO. Since the information has been furnished and the complainant has not come up to canvass his case, the complaint is dismissed as infructuous.

**CIC/YA/C/2016/000060**

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

The complainant vide RTI application dated 09.11.2015 sought information under 3 points regarding to the change of date of birth of one Mr. Deiva Nidhi Das, former Civil Servant officer, Government of Puducherry besides seeking permission to inspect and scan all the files since 2000 wherein date of birth of officers of Puducherry Civil Services & I.A.S officers were dealt with. CPIO vide letter dated 15.12.2015 denied information u/s 8(1)(j) of RTI Act, 2005. The complainant preferred first appeal but the same remained unheard. Feeling aggrieved the complainant approached the Commission.

**Relevant facts emerging during hearing:**

The complainant is absent despite notice. The respondent is present and heard. The CPIO states that the information sought besides being scattered and not readily compiled/available, is exempted from disclosure under clause (j) of Section 8(1).

**Decision:**

After hearing respondent and perusal of record, the Commission finds the reply of CPIO in order. There is no whisper of any element of wider public interest thereby warranting disclosure of the information sought.

The complaint is misconceived and accordingly dismissed.

**CIC/YA/C/2016/000061**

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

The complainant vide RTI application dated 09.11.2015 sought all records, case files alongwith record of proceedings relating to disciplinary proceedings against 5 officers. CPIO vide letter dated 15.12.2015 denied information u/s 8(1)(j) of RTI Act, 2005. The appellant preferred first appeal but the same remained unheard. Feeling aggrieved the complainant approached the Commission.

**Relevant facts emerging during hearing:**

The complainant is absent despite notice. The respondent is present and heard. The CPIO states that the information sought besides being scattered and not readily compiled/available, is exempted from disclosure under clause (j) of Section 8(1). He states that disclosure of such information may pose threat to the security of the respective persons.

**Decision:**

After hearing respondent and perusal of record, the Commission finds the reply of CPIO in order. There is no whisper of any element of wider public interest thereby warranting disclosure of the information sought which is otherwise squarely within the ambit of Section 8(1)(j).

The complaint is misconceived and accordingly dismissed.

**(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:-