

□□□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□
CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
□□□□ □□□□□□□□ (□□□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□)
Club Building (Near Post Office)
□□□□ □□ न □□ □□□□□□, नई □□□□□□ -110067
Old JNU Campus, New Delhi-110067
Tel: +91-11-26182593/26182594
Email: registrycab@gmail.com

File No.: CIC/AB /A/2016/000859-AB

In the matter of:

Fateh Singh

...Appellant

VS

PIO, DRM's Office, Northeast Railway,
SH- 37, Izzat Nagar, Bareilly, U.P- 243122

...Respondent

	Dates
RTI application	: 18.02.2016
CPIO reply	: Not on Record
First Appeal	: 30.03.2016
FAA Order	: Not on Record
Second Appeal	: 11.06.2016
Date of hearing	: 06.10.2017

Facts:

The appellant vide RTI application dated 18.02.2016 raised certain grievances relating to the payment made to Sh. Aftab Khan but not to him despite both of them holding the same post of railway track inspector in respect of the same geographical jurisdiction. He sought the copy of the order and the rule on the basis of which Sh. Aftab Khan was found eligible for such payment. The CPIO's reply or the First Appellate Authority (FAA)'s order is not on record.

Grounds for Second Appeal

The CPIO did not provide the desired information.

Order

Appellant : Present on phone

Respondent : CPIO, Shri V.S. Sagar, Sr. DMM

along with PIO, Shri Ashwini Tiwari, ADEN

During the hearing the respondent CPIO submitted that they had provided the requisite information vide their letter dated 26.05.2017 which is just and proper and hence the case should be dismissed. The appellant submitted that he was not satisfied with the reply received from the respondent as proper information was not provided to him by the respondent authority. The respondent submitted that even when the appellant had failed to mention the specific period (s) for which the said information of payment of travelling allowance was sought in the said RTI application, the respondent had scanned the records of last 25 years but in the absence of any such specific detail regarding the payment made to Sh. Aftab Khan, full information as sought in the said RTI application could not be provided to him under the RTI Act.

On perusal of the case record, it was seen that although the reply provided was just and proper, it was delayed by one and half years **which is deplorable**. No satisfactory explanation was provided by the respondent regarding the delay in sending the requisite reply to the appellant.

The then respondent CPIO, office of the DRM, Izzatnagar is issued warning that full, final and comprehensive reply to an RTI application should have been provided within the time period as stipulated under the RTI Act and he should ensure that in future in every case reply to an RTI application is invariably provided within 30 days of receipt of the said RTI application.

The respondent CPIO should note that in future if the same mistake is noticed by the Commission, more stringent action can be taken against the respondent officer mentioned above.

The present CPIO is also to submit a report to the Commission indicating the name, present address, mobile no., place of posting and designation of the CPIO working at the relevant post in February, 2016 for record.

The present respondent CPIO is directed to serve a copy of this warning to the then CPIO and a copy of the service of the above said warning be submitted to the Commission within 10 days of the receipt of the order.

With the above warning, the appeal is disposed of.

Copies of the order be sent to both the parties free of cost.

[Amitava Bhattacharyya]
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(A.K. Talapatra)
Deputy Registrar