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

CIC/AA/A/2016/230
CICOM/A/2016/00229
CICOM/R/2016/00524

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

1.	Date of RTI application	19.04.2016
2.	Date of reply of the RTI application	26.04.16, 28.4.16, 2.5.16, 12.5.16
3.	CPIO(s) who furnished reply	Registrar, JS(Law), DO to IC(SA), DR in CR,
4.	1st Appeal No. & Date	16259 dt. 20.05.2016
5.	Diary No. of 1st Appeal of the Dak Section	137688
6.	Diary date of the Dak Section	2305.2016
7.	Diary date of 1st Appeal in the office of FAA	24.05.2016
8.	**Date of Hearing**	**23.08.2016**

The appellant has intimated over phone that he is not well, therefore, his first appeal may be decided on merits on the basis of available record and material. Later on, he also intimate the same in writing vide letter dated RTI/P-737/9869/16/R/19791 dated 24.08.2016. Shri T.K. Mohapatra, DO to IC(MP) Shri Ashok Kr Sharma, CPIO, RTI Cell, Shri Umesh Chandra Joshi, DR in Central Registry, Shri Dinesh Kumar, DO to IC(SA) and Shri Kishore Kumar Pukhral, CPIO, Legal Cell were present.

Decision with reasons:-

2. On Point-A of the RTI application, the reply furnished by the DR in Central Registry vide letter dated 12.05.2016 is factual and no intervention is required on the reply of the CPIO.

3. On Point-B of the RTI application, DO to IC(SA) vide letter dated 02.05.2016 has informed the appellant that:-

".....The registry of IC(SA) started functioning since January 2014, The case No.CIC/SS/C/2013/000348 has not transferred to this registry by the erstwhile registry of the IC(SS). The incharge Record Cell has also been consulted and he has intimated that the said file was not received by them. However, efforts are being made to search out the said case file from old records and if it is found, requisite information will be supplied."

Scanning work of all old files of the Commission are being carried out under the supervision of JS(MR). **Shri Dinesh Kumar, CPIO cum DO to IC(SA) is accordingly directed to take the assistance of JS(MR) for getting electronic data of the concerned case files, if available and provide information to the appellant with mutual convenient date.**

4. Point (C) of the RTI application has not been pressed by the appellant in his appeal.

5. On Point (D) of the RTI application, the appellant has sought file movement register (daily diary) and Peon Book for the JS(Admn), DS(Admn), JS(Law), JS(More), DS(GA), Secretary, CIC, Additional Secretary, CIC and of Administration Section, Legal Cell and Registrar from 01.01.2014 till the date of providing the information. In the appeal, the appellant has stated that the information sought has wrongly been described as voluminous by JS(Law). During the hearing, Shri M.K. Sharma, Registrar has stated that as per manual for Office Procedure no file movement register is maintained in the office of the Registrar. Shri Y.K. Singhal, JS(Law) vide letter dated 28.04.2016 has replied that the information sought is voluminous, which will divert the resources of public authority disproportionately, hence same cannot be given.

6. On Points (E) & (F) of the RTI application, the appellant has sought following information:-

> *"(E) Please provide the file Numbers in relation each of the Dak received in the Legal Cell from the Dak Section from 01.02.2016 to 15.04.2016 as per the* ***enclosed list****."*
>
> *(F) Please provide the action taken on each of the Dak received in the Legal Cell and referred to in Point (E) above. This information may be provided in relation to the Dak for which no files have been opened."*

7. Shri Kishore Kr Pukhral, CPIO, Legal Cell has informed during the hearing that the appellant has enclosed a list in which total 118 diary numbers are mentioned on which above said information has been sought. He stated that the information is voluminous and it will divert the resources disproportionately, hence same cannot be given in our reply dated 06.05.2016. He has offered the inspection to the appellant. The reply furnished by the CPIO is appropriate and no intervention is required on the reply of the CPIO. The appellant may inspect the documents, as offered by CPIO, Legal Cell with mutual convenient date.

8. The appeal is disposed off accordingly.

9. 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 Dinesh Kumar, DO to IC(SA), CIC, New Delhi.
3. Shri Kishore Kr Pukhral, CPIO, Legal Cell, CIC, New Delhi.