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

CIC/AA/A/2017/211
CICOM/A/2017/00204
CICOM/R/2017/00397

Name of the appellant : Shri N.P. Sinha,
57, Nandanpuri, Khajpura,
Patna – 800 014.

1.	Date of RTI application	30.04.2017
2.	Date of reply of the RTI application	23.05.2017
3.	CPIO(s) who furnished reply	CPIO, RTI Cell
4.	1st Appeal Date	12.06.2017
5.	Diary No. of 1st Appeal of the Dak Section	142640
6.	Diary date of the Dak Section	22.06.2017
7.	Date of receipt of 1st Appeal in the office of FAA	27.06.2017
8.	**Date of Decision**	**29.06.2017**

Brief facts of the case:-

In the RTI application, the appellant has sought three points information in respect of his letter dated 29.03.2017 regarding hearing before Larger Bench.

2. Shri Ashok Kumar Sharma, CPIO, RTI Cell vide letter dated 23.05.2017 has responded that:-

"In this regard, it is stated that a reply has already been sent to you by Shri Piyush Agarwal, Registrar, vide letter dated 22.05.2017 (Copy enclosed)."

Shri Piyush Agarwal, Registrar in the above said letter dated 22.05.2017 stated that:-

"This is with reference to your letter dated 29th March, 2017 (Diary no.122883/2017), requesting therein to refer you 6 appeals/complaints to a larger bench against the decision dated 20.02.17 passed by Honorable Information Commissioner (SH).

You are hereby informed that a decision taken by the Information Commission is binding as per Section 19(7) of the Right to Information Act 2005 and there is no provision to refer the case to a larger bench."

3. In the appeal, the appellant has stated that:

"(i) Information and copy as demanded in sr.nos. (1) to (3) of Form-A has not been provided by CPIO.

(ii) CPIO has only enclose a letter of reply indicating the provisions provided in RTI Act. This letter did not reflect the decision taken on my petition. As such, I again requested Mr. P. Agarwal for a proper decision on my petition."

P.T.O.

Decision with reasons:-

4. On perusal of the RTI application, reply of the CPIO and appeal, it is observed that the reply furnished by the Registrar is appropriate, therefore, no intervention is required on the part of the FAA.

5. The appeal is disposed off.

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 29th June, 2017

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

Copy to:-

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

29/06/17