

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

August Kranti Bhawan, Bhikaji Cama Place,
New Delhi-110066

F. No. **CIC/KY/A /2016/000610/MCDND**

Date of Hearing : **15.11.2017**
Date of Decision : **15.11.2017**
Appellant/Complainant : **Ms. Nirmala Devi**
Respondent : **PIO/ Deputy Director-
VS/Najafgarh, South Delhi
Municipal Corporation**

Through :
Dr. Hemant Kaushik
Dy. Director (VS)

Information Commissioner : Shri Yashovardhan Azad

Relevant facts emerging from appeal:

RTI application filed on : 06.11.2015
PIO replied on : -
First Appeal filed on : -
First Appellate Order on : -
2nd Appeal/complaint received on : 26.03.2016

Information sought and background of the case:

Vide RTI application dated 06.11.2015, the appellant sought information relating to plots No. 525 to 528 near Dwarka Metro Station Sector 16, Dwarka and the documents relating to transfer of title of said plots. The PIO replied vide letter dated 09.12.2015 and intimated the appellant that copy of requisite documents has already been supplied and annexed a copy of receipt signed by the appellant to that effect. However, dissatisfied with the information furnished the appellant filed an appeal which remained unheard. Feeling aggrieved, the appellant approached the Commission.

Relevant facts emerging during hearing:

Both the parties are present and heard. The appellant states that documents furnished to her does not serve her purpose as they do not reflect ownership title of the plots in question. Per contra, the PIO states that some plots at Sector -16, Dwarka (Kakrola colony) were earmarked for the persons engaged in dairy business. He states that the said plots were given on lease-hold basis and the appellant is seeking documents of ownership which infact is non-

tenable. He states that the said plots were allotted to one Naresh Kumar who, thereafter, authorised the appellant being his sister to run cattle dairy business from the said plots under intimation to the Department. He states that the said authorisation documents as submitted to the Department has been furnished to the appellant and no further information is available on record.

Decision:

After hearing parties and perusal of record, the Commission finds that requisite documents have been furnished to the appellant. As per the clarification offered by the PIO in course of hearing, the plots in question are granted on lease hold basis and there is no record of ownership/mutation as wrongly perceived by the appellant. No further action is called for in the matter.

The appeal is disposed of.

(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:-
