

IMMEDIATE/RTI MATTER

No. 2/2/2018 – RTIC/00027
Government of India
Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions
Department of Personnel and Training

North Block, New Delhi-110001.
Dated the 03rd January, 2018

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

Subject: Transfer of RTI application under RTI Act, 2005

An RTI application dated 26.12.2017 (reg. No. DOP&T/R/2018/00027), of Shri Omprakash Kashiram, is being transferred to the Central Information Commission under Section 6(3) of the RTI Act, 2005, as the subject matter of information also pertains to the aforementioned public authority. The RTI Application has also been forwarded to the concerned CPIO of this Department to whom the information sought closely pertains.

2. Application fee of Rs. 10/- has been received in this Department by IPO No. 21F 174627 vide receipt No. 37694 dated 02.01.2018.

Encl.: as above.

[Signature]
(A.K. Singh)

Under Secretary to the Govt. of India
Tel: 011 2309 3214

To,
The CPIO, RTI Cell,
Central Information Commission,
Baba Gangnath Marg, Munirka,
New Delhi- 110067.




102253
10-1-2018

Ms. Preeti Khanna, US (RTI), DOPT

Copy for information to:-

<p>Shri Omprakash Kashiram, Amol Apartment, 3/16, Waldhuni, Kalyan- 421301.</p>	<p>This is not a reply to your RTI application. Your RTI application is being transferred herewith by the RTI cell of DOPT to the CPIOs/Authorities/Ministries who/which are felt dealing with the subject and hence the appropriate CPIO/Authorities to give reply to your application. You are requested to follow up with the aforementioned public authority with reference to information sought by you.</p> <p>1st appeal against reply of the above Public Authorities may be filed with above Public Authorities directly. 1st Appeal against the above transfer of your RTI Application, may be filed with Shri D.K. Sengupta, Deputy Secretary (JCA), DOP&T, North Block, New Delhi-110001 - Telefax - 23092982. within 30 days.</p>
---	--

RTI cell
RTI
1-7-RTI cell
[Signature]
11/1/18



185681
18/12/17
9
Annexure 'A'

The Public Information Officer
Department of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pension
2nd Floor, Sardar Patel Bhawan
Parliament Street
New Delhi - 110 001

RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT 2005

Full Name of applicant :

OMPRAKASH KASHIRAM

Address :

AMOL APARTMENT
3/16, WALDHUNI
KALYAN - 421 301

Particulars of information required :

i) Subject matter of information

Information may be provided
on the following orders :

(i) CIC/SCOF/IA/2017/116688
dated 08.12.2017 (copy enclosed).

(ii) CIC/SCOF/IA/2017/112726
dated 08.12.2017 (copy enclosed).

(iii) CIC/SCOF/IA/2017/116689
dated 08.12.2017 (copy enclosed).

Shri Radha Krishna Mathur, CIC
has not signed order with blue pen/
blue ink pen and same is not issue
to me only received Xerox copy of
order and Dy. Registrar is not part
commission as per the RTI Act.

ii) The period to which the information
related

2005 to 2017

iii) Description of information

Information is required as per
Appendix 'A' enclosed with this
Application. Information may be
provided within 48 hours.

iv) Whether information is required by _____
post or in person

By post

Whether the applicant is below poverty _____

No.


ENCL.IPO No. 21F 174627

& Appendix 'A'.

Date : 26 December 2017

Place, Kalyan


(Ompakash Kashiram)



8

APPENDIX 'A'

1. Please provide the documents regarding the copy of appeals were not provided to respondents by all commissioners and chief information commissioners since from 2005 to 2017 and other side Shri Radha Krishna Mathur, Present Chief Information Commissioner has issued enclosed order by intimating that the appellant is admonished/warned not to file frivolous/vague RTI application/complaints/appeals in large nos. as it would disproportionately divert the resources of the Public Authority as well as the valuable time of this commission (Para 9 of all orders enclosed with RTI Application)
2. Please provide the documents regarding the name of PIOs were not indicating in all orders issued from 2005 to 2017 by all commissioners and chief information commissioners for claiming of Rs.25000/- under the provision of RTI Act 2005.
3. Please provide the documents regarding the letters numbers/orders numbers were not quoting by all commissioners and chief information commissioners in their final decisions/orders and only dates of letters of PIOs were mentioning by CIC.
4. Please provide the documents regarding the information letters/orders were issued by PIOs and hearing of appeals were attended by other officers/PIOs who had not been issued information orders/letters.
5. Please provide the documents regarding final orders/decisions were not signed by blue pen/blue ink pen and same were not issued to applicants by all commissioners and chief information commissioners since from 2005 to 2017.
6. Please provide the information that all commissioners and chief information commissioners are cheating to applicants since from 2005 to 2017 and wastage time and money of applicants for point No.1 to 5 above.
7. Please provide the documents regarding all records/appeals/decisions/orders were destroyed by all commissioners and all chief information commissioners since from 2005 to 2017.
8. Please provide the documents regarding all hearing were taken through video conferencing by all commissioners and all chief information commissioners since from 2005 to 2017 under the provision of parliament act. Please provide the copy of parliament Act under which all hearing since from 2005 to 2017 were taken through video conferencing which is illegal procedures.
9. Please provide the documents regarding all orders were issued by Xerox not original copy of orders/decisions, please provide the copy of all parliament acts under which above orders/decision were issued in Xerox copy.



En.d. sur to RTI App/17.c. 07 an
21 26/12/17 7
CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

Baba Gang Nath Marg, Munirka,

New Delhi-110067

Tel : +91-11-26186535

Appeal No. CIC/ SCOFI /A/2017/116688

Appellant: Omprakash Kashiram
03/16, Amol Apartment,
Waldhuni Kalyan, Thane 421301

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer
Addl. Registrar, Supreme Court of India,
Tilak Marg, Supreme Court, Mandi House,
New Delhi-110201.

Date of Hearing: 08.12.2017

Dated of Decision: 08.12.2017

ORDER

Facts:

1. The appellant filed RTI application dated 20.11.2016 seeking information regarding: why Suo Moto action has not been taken for appointment of Lokpal and Lokayuktas by the Supreme Court of India and the Chief Justice of India, New Delhi under the Lokpal and Lokayuktas Act 2014 after lapse of three years on enactment of Lokpal and Lokayuktas Act 2014 etc.
2. The CPIO responded on 15.11.2016 by transferring the RTI application to the concerned offices u/s 6(3) of the RTI Act. The appellant filed first appeal dated 30.12.2016 with First Appellate Authority (FAA). The FAA response is not on record. The appellant filed second appeal on 01.03.2017 before the Commission on the ground that information should be provided to him.

Hearing:

3. The respondent participated in the hearing in person and was represented by their advocate. The appellant did not participate in the hearing.

6. The respondent stated that the appellant has been replied to vide letters dated 30.11.2016 and 20.12.2016. The respondent stated that the appellant's RTI application was transferred, in respect of point no. 2 to 5 of his RTI application, to the Director, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India and the Under Secretary, (Lokpal), DoPT, New Delhi for appropriate action.

5. The respondent stated that the sought for information is presumptive and vague in nature. The appellant is seeking information from the year 1947 till 2016.

Discussion/ observation:

6. The Commission observed that the steps/action taken by the respondent in dealing with the RTI application is satisfactory.

7. The Commission observed that the appellant has failed to attend the hearings in his cases on Video Conferencing repeatedly.

Decision:

8. No intervention is required in the matter at the level of this Commission.

9. The appellant is admonished not to file frivolous/vague RTI applications/complaints/appeals as it disproportionately diverts the resources of the Public Authority as well as the valuable time of this Commission.

10. Dy. Registrar is directed to take a note that henceforth; appellant may be directed to be present personally in his cases before the Commission, New Delhi.

The appeal is disposed of. Copy of the order be given to the parties free of cost.

(Radha Krishna Mathur)
Chief Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy
(S.C. Sharma)
Dy. Registrar

25. 26/12/17

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
Baba Gang Nath Marg, Munirka,
New Delhi -110067
Tel : +91-11-26186535

Appeal No. CIC/ SCOFI /A/2017/116689

Appellant: Omprakash Kashiram
03/16, Amol Apartment,
Waldhuni Kalyan, Thane 421301

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer
Addl. Registrar, Supreme Court of India, Tilak
Marg, Supreme Court, Mandi House, New Delhi-
110201.

Date of Hearing: 08.12.2017
Dated of Decision: 08.12.2017

ORDER

Facts:

1. The appellant filed RTI application dated 24.10.2016 seeking information that under which provisions the BCCI is selecting players for Indian cricket-team etc.
2. The CPIO responded on 15.11.2016 that the requested information is not covered under section 2(f) of the RTI Act. The appellant filed first appeal dated 24.11.2016 with First Appellate Authority (FAA). The FAA response is not on record. The appellant filed second appeal on 02.03.2017 before the Commission on the ground that information should be provided to him.

Hearing:

3. The respondent participated in the hearing in person and represented by their advocate. The appellant did not participate in the hearing in fact, informed that he will not attend hearing and shall not authorise anyone to attend hearing on his behalf.
4. The respondent stated that the appellant has been replied to vide letter dated 15.11.2016. The respondent stated that, the sought for

4
information is not covered in the definition of 'Information' under section 2(f) of the RTI Act. The respondent stated that it is beyond the jurisdiction and scope of the duties of the CPIO to interpret the law, judgments/orders of the Hon'ble Court or to give explanation, opine, comments or advise on the matters etc.

5. The respondent stated that the sought for information is presumptive and vague in nature. The appellant is seeking information from the year 1947 till 2016.

Discussion/ observation:

6. The Commission observed that the steps/action taken by the respondent in dealing with the RTI application is satisfactory.

7. The Commission observed that the appellant has failed to attend the hearings in his cases repeatedly. Orders in case nos. CIC/PRSEC/A/2016/300001 dated 21.07.2017 and CIC/PMOIN/A/2017/115930 dated 12.10.2017 may be referred to.


Decision:


8. No intervention is required in the matter at the level of this Commission.

9. The appellant is admonished not to file frivolous/vague RTI applications/complaints/appeals in large nos. as it would disproportionately divert the resources of the Public Authority as well as the valuable time of this Commission.

10. Dy. Registrar is directed that henceforth appellant shall be directed to be present personally in his cases before the Commission in New Delhi.

The appeal is disposed of. Copy of the order be given to the parties free of cost.


(Radha Krishna Mathur)
Chief Information Commissioner


Authenticated true copy
(S.C. Sharma)
Dy. Registrar

20112117 3
CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

Baba Gang Nath Marg, Munirka,

New Delhi -110067

Tel : +91-11-26186535

Appeal No. CIC/ SCOFI /A/2017/112726

Appellant: Omprakash Kashiram
03/16, Amol Apartment,
Waldhuni Kalyan, Thane 421301

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer
Addl. Registrar, Supreme Court of India, Tilak
Marg, Supreme Court, Mandi House, New Delhi-
110201.

Date of Hearing: 08.12.2017
Dated of Decision: 08.12.2017

ORDER

Facts:

1. The appellant filed RTI application dated 08.10.2016 seeking information as whether BCCI is a public authority under the RTI Act etc.
2. The CPIO responded on 24.10.2016 that the requested information is not covered under section 2(f) of the RTI Act. The appellant filed first appeal dated 06.11.2016 with First Appellate Authority (FAA). The FAA responded on 30.12.2016. The appellant filed second appeal on 11.02.2017 before the Commission on the ground that information should be provided to him.

Hearing:

3. The respondent participated in the hearing in person and was also represented by their advocate. The appellant did not participate in the hearing.
4. The respondent stated that the appellant has been replied to vide letter dated 24.10.2016. The respondent stated that the sought for information is not covered in the definition of 'Information' under section 2(f) of the RTI Act. The respondent stated that it is beyond the jurisdiction and scope of the duties of the CPIO to interpret the law, judgments/orders of the

2
Hon'ble Court or to give explanation, opine, comments or advise on the matters etc. Further, the respondent stated that the all the judgments/orders/case status of the Hon'ble Supreme Court are available on the website of the Supreme Court viz www.sci.nic.in. In addition to above, the respondent stated that the appellant has been informed that the certified copies of the judicial record can be obtained under the Supreme Court Rules, 2013 on payment of prescribed fee and charges, giving full particulars of the case.

5. The respondent stated that the sought for information is presumptive and vague in nature. Reply to the queries would be interpretation of the orders of the Hon'ble Court etc.

Discussion/ observation:

6. The Commission observed that the steps/action taken by the respondent in dealing with the RTI application is satisfactory.

7. The Commission observed that the appellant has failed to attend the hearings in his cases on Video Conferencing repeatedly.

Decision:

8. No intervention is required in the matter at the level of this Commission.

9. The appellant is admonished not to file frivolous/vague RTI applications/complaints/appeals as it disproportionately diverts the resources of the Public Authority as well as the valuable time of this Commission.

10. Dy. Registrar is directed to take a note that henceforth; appellant may be directed to be present personally in his cases before the Commission, New Delhi.

The appeal is disposed of. Copy of the order be given to the parties free of cost.

(Radha Krishna Mathur)
Chief Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy
(S.C. Sharma)
Dy. Registrar

G.A.R: 6
(See Rule 22 (1))

कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत एवं पेंशन मंत्रालय
MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, P.G. & PENSIONS
(कार्मिक और प्रशिक्षण विभाग)
(DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL & TRAINING)
Website : <http://persmin.gov.in>

सं०/No. 37694 रसीद / RECEIPT दिनांक / Dated 21/1/18

Received from Omprakesh Kashiram, Anol Mentur, Icaigan - 421301

से प्राप्त

पत्र सं० / संदर्भ संख्या / Letter No. / Reference No. दिनांक / Dated / 20

नगद / बैंकर्स चेक / ड्राफ्ट / भा० पो० ऑ० सं०

In cash / by cheque / by Bank Draft on Ten only

सूचना के अधिकार अधिनियम, 2005 के शुल्क हेतु प्राप्त की।
account of fee under Right to Information Act, 2005

आद्यहस्ताक्षर / Initials

रुपये / Rs. 10/- 21F-174622 पदनाम / Designation

