

**CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION**

2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, August Kranti Bhawan  
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066  
website:cic.gov.in

Appeal No.:-CIC/NCBRK/A/2016/299616/DGIBH-BJ

Appellant : Mr. Harihar Singh Yadav,  
Respondent : CPIO  
Central Bureau of Narcotics,  
Neemuch, M.P.  
Date of Hearing : 11.08.2017  
Date of Decision : 11.08.2017

Date of filing of RTI applications	23.01.2016
CPIO's response	Not on Record
Date of filing the First appeal	05.03.2016
First Appellate Authority's response	16/18.05.2016
Date of diarised receipt of second appeal by the Commission	19.08.2016

**ORDER**

**FACTS:**

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 04 points regarding certified copy of bill sent to P.A.O. Gwalior on the basis of fixation table dated 27.10.2014 and issues related thereto.

Dissatisfied on not receiving any response from the CPIO, the Appellant approached the FAA. The FAA, vide its order dated 16/18.05.2016, directed the PIO to provide information within 15 days from the date of the order.

**HEARING:**

**Facts emerging during the hearing:**

The following were present:

**Appellant:** Absent;

**Respondent:** Mr. A. K. Tulsidas, District Narcotics Officer through VC;

The Appellant remained absent during the hearing, Mr. Vineet Singh representative of NIC studio at Ghazipur confirmed his absence. However, vide his written submission dated 05.08.2017, the Appellant stated that his arrear bills had since been settled and that the RTI application filed by him should be treated as infructuous and treated as withdrawn. The Respondent confirmed that the necessary arrear bills due to him had been paid. During the hearing, it was informed that the Appellant worked as a Sub-Inspector in their office and had retired in the year 2013. In his RTI application he had highlighted the personal grievance related to payment of arrears relating to Pay and Allowances that were examined as per extant guidelines and

resolved. Essentially, it was a personal grievance matter that was dealt with accordingly.

The Commission observed that under the provisions of the RTI Act, 2005, only such information as is available and existing and held by the public authority or is under control of the public authority can be provided. The PIO is not supposed to create information that is not a part of the record. He is also not required to interpret information or furnish replies to hypothetical questions. Similarly, redressal of grievance, reasons for non compliance of rules/contesting the actions of the respondent public authority are outside the purview of the Act.

**DECISION:**

In the light of the facts available on record and the submissions made by the Respondent and the satisfaction expressed by the Appellant relating to resolution of his personal grievance, no further intervention of the Commission is required in the matter.

The Appeal stands disposed accordingly.

**(Bimal Julka)**  
**Information Commissioner**

Authenticated True Copy:

(K.L.Das)  
Deputy Registrar