Central Information Commission
Baba Gang Nath Marg,
Munirka, New Delhi -110067.

CIC/AA/A/2018/283
CICOM/A/2018/60170
CICOM/R/2018/50699

Name of the appellant : Shri Mohit Kumar Gupta,
B-10, Karampura,
Nr. Ambedkar University,
(Karampura Campus),
PS: Moti Nagar,
New Delhi – 110 015.

1.	Date of online RTI application	11.09.2018
2.	Date of reply of the RTI application	27.09.18 & 05.10.18
3.	CPIO(s) who furnished reply	CPIO, RTI Cell & DR to CR-I
4.	Online 1st Appeal Date	11.11.2018
5.	**Date of Hearing**	**27.11.2018**

Appellant along with Advocate Narvinder Thakran was present. Shri Krishan Avtar Talwar, CPIO cum DR to CR-I, Mrs. Savita Taluja, CPIO cum SO(Admn) and Shri TBJS Rajappa, CPIO, RTI Cell were present during the hearing.

Decision with reasons:-

On perusal of the RTI application, CPIOs reply and submissions made by the appellant in the appeal as well as during hearing, it is observed that:-

1. On Points 1 & 2 of the RTI application, although CPIO has provided the information that data is available in public domain but since the appellant has requested for certified copy of the Order No. CIC/CR-1/2017/0007 (Pt.2) dated 14.06.2018, **direction is hereby given to Shri Krishan Avtar Talwar, CPIO & DR to CR-I to provide certified copy as per DoPT OM No.10/1/2013-IR dated 06/10/2015 to the appellant within 01 week from the date of receipt of the order.**

2. On Points 3 & 4 information furnished by the CPIO is appropriate and factual, therefore, no intervention is required on the part of the FAA.

3. On Points 5 & 10, CPIO has demanded further fee Rs.60/- and Rs.4/- respectively as photocopy charges through DD/IPO in favour of "PAO CAT, New Delhi" or by cash at the counter of Dak Section (Room No.109) of the Commission, which the appellant objected that mode of payment of charges since the RTI Application was filed online through RTI Portal, the commission was required to provide the link for payment of additional fees through the said portal as is done by the other public authorities. In

RECEIVED
05 DEC 2018
D. No.....
Initials.....

P.T.O.

this regard, it is to mention that available mode of further payment/fee has been communicated to the appellant by CPIO. If appellant requires requisite copies, he may deposit the amount as intimated by the CPIO. No further action lies with the CPIO as well as FAA.

4. On points 6 & 7, appellant has stated during the hearing that these points have been clubbed by the CPIO in his reply and requested to provide reply of each point. On perusal of CPIO's reply, it is observed that both the points are similar, therefore, FAA finds no irregularity in clubbing. CPIO has provided appropriate information, therefore, no intervention is required on the part of the FAA.

5. On Points 8, 9 & 14, appellant has alleged that these points were also clubbed by CPIO in his reply. However, on perusal of the records, it is found that point-wise factual information has been furnished by deemed CPIOs, Shri Piyush Agarwal, Registrar and Shri R.K. Arora, PPS to CIC, therefore, no intervention is required on the part of the FAA.

6. On Points 16, 17 and 18 information furnished by the CPIOs is appropriate and factual, therefore, no intervention is required on the part of the FAA.

7. After the hearing, appellant has sent an email and sought copies of the written briefs submitted by the CPIOs. In this regard, it is stated that no written briefs have been submitted by any of the CPIO to the FAA.

8. The appeal is, therefore, disposed of accordingly.

9. In case the appellant is aggrieved by the decision, he is free to file second appeal, if he so desires, before the Central Information Commission, Baba Gang Nath Marg, Munirka, New Delhi-110067 against this order within 90 days.

Dated the 4th December, 2018.

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

Copy to:-

05/12/18

1. Shri TBJS Rajappa, CPIO, RTI Cell, CIC, New Delhi.
2. Shri Krishan Avtar Talwar, CPIO cum DR to CR-I, CIC, New Delhi.