Central Information Commission
2nd Floor, 'B' Wing, August Kranti Bhawan,
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066.

CIC/AA/A/2016/185
CICOM/A/2016/00184
CICOM/R/2016/00402

Name of the appellant : Shri R.K. Jain,
1512-B, Bhishm Pitamah Marg, Wazir Nagar,
New Delhi -110 003.

1.	Date of RTI application	21.03.2016
2.	Date of reply of the RTI application	31.03.2016
3.	CPIO(s) who furnished reply	CPIO, Legal Cell
4.	1st Appeal No. & Date	16229 dt. 13.04.2016 16270 dt. 13.05.2016
5.	Diary No. of 1st Appeal of the Dak Section	128837 & 135367
6.	Diary date of the Dak Section	18.04.2016 & 16.05.2016
7.	Diary date of 1st Appeal in the office of FAA	19.04.2016 & 17.05.2016
8.	**Date of Hearing**	**26.07.2016**

The appellant was present when Shri Y.K. Singhal, JS(Law) and Shri Kishore Kr. Pukhral, CPIO, Legal Cell were also present during the hearing.

Decision with reasons:-

2. During the hearing, the appellant has stated that the CPIO, Legal Cell has denied the information on Points (A), (B) & (C) of the RTI application with the plea that the information asked for is voluminous which will divert the resources of public authority disproportionately. However, the CPIO has offered the inspection. The appellant has further stated during the hearing that he has learnt that large numbers of dak received in the office of the JS(Law) and Legal Cell have not been taken on record and thus not acted upon, and in order to cover it up, most of the dak have been destroyed. Along with the RTI application, the appellant has also provided a list of dak diary numbers, which were sent from Dak Section to Legal Cell and office of the JS(Law).

On perusal of the list provided by the appellant in the RTI application, it is seen that there is total 124 diary numbers and dates of the years 2013 & 2015 are mentioned and the appellant has sought the copies of each of the diary numbers received in the office of JS(Law) or Legal Cell. FAA is of the view that the information sought is really very voluminous and agreed with reply of the JS(Law) that it will divert the resources of public authority disproportionately.

3. On Point (D) of the RTI application, the appellant has sought date and diary number under which the notice for SLP No.25719 of 2012 was received in CIC from the Hon'ble Supreme Court along with copy of the notice and first page of the said SLP. Shri Y.K. Singhal, JS(Law) cum CPIO has replied that the information is not held in his office. During the hearing, the appellant has stated that the CPIO has deliberately and malafidely provided false, incorrect and misleading information in as much as the SLP No.25719 of 2012 is dealt with in file No.CIC/Legal/2011/102 of the Legal Cell of CIC.

4. It is surprised to note that the appellant is giving the file number whereas JS(Law) is stating that no information is available with him in this regard. It seems that the reply has been furnished without proper scrutiny of the files in Legal Cell. **Direction is given to CPIO, Legal Cell and JS(Law) to re-visit the matter and provide the information within 10 working days from the date of receipt of the order.**

5. The appeal is disposed off accordingly.

6. In case the appellant is aggrieved by the decision, he is free to file second appeal, if he so desires, before the CIC in Room No.185, Ground Floor, August Kranti Bhawan, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066 against this order within 90 days.

Dated the 22nd August, 2016.

(Achla Sinha)
Additional Secretary & First Appellate Authority
Tel: 26162290

Copy to:-.

1. The CPIO, RTI Cell, CIC, New Delhi.
2. Shri Y.K. Singhal, JS(Law), CIC, New Delhi.
3. Shri Kishore Kr Pukhral, CPIO, Legal Cell, CIC, New Delhi.