

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

F. No. CIC/YA/A/2014/002410

Date of Hearing : **20.09.2017**
Date of Decision : **16.10.2017**
Appellant/Complainant : **Anand Rai**
Respondent : **PIO, Medical Council of India**

Through:-

Shri Shikhar Ranjan

Information Commissioner : **Shri Yashovardhan Azad**

Relevant facts emerging from appeal:

RTI application filed on : 17.04.2014.
PIO replied on : 01.05.2014
First Appeal filed on : 05.05.2015
First Appellate Order on : 02.06.2014
2nd Appeal/complaint received on :

Information sought and background of the case:

Vide RTI application dated 17.04.2014, the appellant sought the following :

1. *From October, 2008 to 31st March, 2014, in how many cases permission granted by Medical Council of India for migration of MBBS student from one University – copy of NOC letters*
2. *Copy of rules, regulations, gazette notification regarding migration/transper of MBBS students*

PIO vide letter date 01.05.2014 furnished information with regard to point No. 1, as available on record and in respect of point No.2, the appellant was informed that information is available in the website of the Council. Being dissatisfied, the appellant filed an appeal. The FAA vide order dated 02.06.2014 observed that PIO has provided maximum information as per available records and informed that under Rule 6(4) of the migration rules of the Council, migration within the same State is to be done by State Govt. subject to GME regulations of the council, for which the appellant has to approach the DME of the concerned State for details. Only interstate transfers are considered by the MCI.

Feeling aggrieved, the appellant approached the Commission.

Relevant facts emerging during hearing:

The Appellant is absent despite notice. The respondent is present and heard. The PIO states that the appellant has been informed as regards the number of times, MCI had granted permission for Inter University migration for MBBS course. However, copy of NOC letters issued in each case of migration was denied as the same was exempt from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) as the reasons for migration are personal in nature to the respective candidate and disclosure of same had no relation with any larger public interest. As regards information sought under point no 2, the PIO apprises the Commission that the same is already placed in public domain through the website of MCI.

As the appellant chose to remain absent, his views could not be elicited.

Decision:

After hearing the respondent and perusal of record, the Commission finds the reply of PIO to be in order. No ground for interference with decision of PIO & FAA is made out.

The appeal is 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:-