

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

(Room No.313, CIC Bhawan, Baba Gangnath Marg, Munirka, New Delhi-110067)

Before Prof. M. Sridhar Acharyulu (Madabhushi Sridhar), CIC

Second Appeal No.: CIC/EPFOG/A/2018/625979

Shri Saurabh Katyal

Appellant

Versus

CPIO, EPFO, Chandigarh

Respondent

Order Sheet: RTI filed on 18.02.2018, CPIO replied on 15.03.2018, FAO on 20.04.2018, Second appeal filed on 15.07.2018, Hearing on 05.09.2018;

Proceedings on 05.09.2018: Appellant represented by his father Mr. Anurag Katyal from NIC Allahabad, Public Authority represented by CPIO. Mr. Sukhveer Singh, Regional Commissioner from NIC Chandigarh:

Date of Decision – 16.10.2018: Disposed of.

ORDER

FACTS:

1. The appellant sought information regarding particulars of EPF Account No. and EPF Account Statement(s) of my wife Mrs. Samita. The CPIO vide letter dated Nil replied to the appellant. The appellant filed first appeal on the ground that incomplete information was provided to him. The FAA vide order dated 20.04.2018, asked the appellant for inspection of records. Dissatisfied with the response, the appellant approached this Commission.

Decision :

2. Upon perusal of the records and submissions made by the parties, the Commission finds that the CPIO has provided the available information to the appellant within the time frame. Information was not denied though the husband who is in litigation with wife and seeking PF details. The father of appellant pleaded that though Mr. Saurabh Katyal who is fighting litigation with his wife is not a third party as per the law. The officer submitted that they have not denied any

information. They have provided even PF details of Smt. A. Smitha whose name does not match properly with the name given by the appellant. The Commission finds that sufficient information has been furnished by the respondent authority and further directions is not required in this matter.

3. The Commission in his earlier cases opined that if husband files the RTI seeking the status of job of his wife or vice versa. The PF officer can share the information regarding the status of employment of spouses if they possess the same. The PF share is meant for offering social security to the employee and PF money exclusively belongs to the account holding employees in which no other person has a share. The spouses in litigation cannot use RTI to harass other spouses.

4. In view of the above, the Commission directs the respondent authority to provide copy of any document that reflects the employment status as on date shall be furnished to the appellant, within 15 days from the date of receipt of this Order.

Sd/-
(M. Sridhar Acharyulu)
Central Information Commissioner