

केन्द्रीय सूचना आयोग  
CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION  
बाबा गंग नाथ मार्ग, मुनिरका  
Baba Gang Nath Marg, Munirka  
नई दिल्ली-110067  
Tel: +91-11-26106140/26179548  
Email – [haro.sen@nic.in](mailto:haro.sen@nic.in)

सूचना आयुक्त : दिव्य प्रकाश सिन्हा  
INFORMATION COMMISSIONER : DIVYA PRAKASH SINHA

File No. : CIC/MOIB/A/2017/309218/SD  
Date of Hearing :13/11/2017  
Date of Decision :13/11/2017

**Relevant facts emerging from the Appeal:**

Appellant	:	Devendra Suryavanshi
Respondent	:	CPIO, O/o Prasar Bharti, High Power Transmitter, Air Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh.
RTI application filed on	:	30/05/2016
PIO replied on	:	20/06/2016
First appeal filed on	:	01/07/2016
First Appellate Authority order	:	No order
Second Appeal dated	:	19/09/2016

**Information sought:**

The Appellant sought information through 8 points regarding budget allocation for different departments of AIR Centre, Aligarh for the financial years 2013-14, 2014-15, 2016-16, 2016-17, with copies of all bills and quotations made in this regard, process of buying different items in March 2016 and particulars of the officer who oversees the process of budgeting.

**Grounds for the Second Appeal:**

The CPIO has not provided the desired information.

**Relevant Facts emerging during Hearing:**

The following were present:-

**Appellant:** Not present.

**Respondent:** Mayank Kumar, Director (Eng) & CPIO, All India Radio, Jamalpur (UP) present in person.

CPIO submitted that appropriate reply had been provided to the Appellant seeking additional fees as photocopying charges, which he has not paid till date. CPIO also presented the set of documents for which the fees was sought.

**Decision**

Commission observes from the perusal of facts on record that the primary grievance of the Appellant was not being provided with breakup of photocopying fees sought by the CPIO. It is also observed that the Appellant has sought for information in a cumbersome manner. Commission does not completely agree with the contention of the Appellant that he was not provided with the break-up of fees as CPIO had appropriately informed the number of pages and the rate at which the fees is being sought. Although, Commission opines that, where CPIO was able to specify the number of pages corresponding for each query, the same should have been mentioned in the original reply dated 20.06.2016.

Appellant has not availed the opportunity to appear before the Commission to plead his case/contest CPIO's submission. In view of the foregoing observations, no further action is warranted.

**The appeal is disposed of accordingly.**

**(Divya Prakash Sinha)**  
**Information Commissioner**

**File No. : CIC/MOIAB/A/2017/309218/SD**

**Authenticated true copy**

(H P Sen)  
Dy. Registrar/Designated Officer

