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

CIC/AA/A/2017/106
CICOM/A/2017/00100
CICOM/R/2017/00100

Name of the appellant : Shri R.N. Walujkar,
05/454, Sanegurujinagar,
Kurduvadi (413208),
Distt. Solapur (Maharashtra).

1.	Date of RTI application	16.01.2017
2.	Date of reply of the RTI application	31.01.2017
3.	CPIO(s) who furnished reply	DR to CIC(AB)
4.	1st Appeal Date	06.03.2017
5.	Diary No. of 1st Appeal of the Dak Section	112064
6.	Diary date of the Dak Section	22.02.2017
7.	Date of receipt of 1st Appeal in the office of FAA	07.04.2017
8.	**Date of Decision**	**11.04.2017**

Brief facts of the case:-

The appellant has filed an RTI application dated 16.01.2017 in connection with non-compliance of Commission's order No.CIC/VS/A/2014/001846 dated 25.01.2016.

2. Shri A.K. Talpatra, DR to CIC(AB) cum CPIO vide his letter dated 31.01.2017 has informed the appellant that:-

"(1) The Registry has started functioning since March 2016. Hearing started from 25.04.2016. Your case related to 25.01.2016.

(2) We have sent a letter to the respondent to explain the reason for non-compliance of CIC decision (copy enclosed).

Decision with reasons:-

3. On perusal of the RTI application and reply of the CPIO, it is observed that the appellant has not sought any information from the CPIO of the Commission. The appellant has informed vide his above mentioned RTI application that the respondent has not complied with the above mentioned orders of the Commission even after lapse of nearly 1 year. However, the CPIO has took the cognizance of it and directed the respondent vide letter dated 30.01.2017 to provide full information to the complainant as per said CIC order.

C.I.C. / के. सू. आ.
RECEIVED
12 APR 2017
Initials:

P.T.O.

4. Now from the perusal of the appeal, it is observed that the appellant is not aggrieved with the response of the CPIO. He has stated in the appeal that the respondent has provided incomplete, misleading and without facts finding report as sought for by him and other brief of his grievances.

5. In this regard, it is to mention that the FAA of the Commission has the jurisdiction to direct CPIO of the Commission and has no powers to give any direction to the CPIO of the other public authority. Since the appellant is not aggrieved with the response of the CPIO of the Commission, no intervention is required on the part of the FAA, CIC. However, the appellant is advised to file non-non-compliance of the Commission's order separately, if he feels aggrieved by CPIO response, in pursuance to CIC's order.

6. The appeal is, therefore, disposed off.

7. 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 11th April, 2017

(Rakesh Kumar Singh)
Additional Secretary & First Appellate Authority
Tel: 26162290

Copy to:-

1. The CPIO, RTI Cell, CIC, New Delhi.

12/04/17