

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

CIC/AA/A/2019/31 & 33  
CICOM/A/2019/00024 & 25  
CICOM/R/2019/01077

Name of the appellant : Shri Vishal Prasad,  
21/1, Jelia Para Lane,  
P.O. Salkia, P.S. Golabari,  
Howrah - 711 106.

1.	Date of RTI application	15.10.2018
2.	Date of reply of the RTI application	27.11.18, 29.11.18 & 03.12.18
3.	CPIO(s) who furnished reply	DO to ex.CIC(RK), DO to IC(DP) & DO to IC(SB)
4.	1 <sup>st</sup> Appeal Date	10.01.2019 (two appeals)
5.	Diary No. of Dak Section on both 1 <sup>st</sup> Appeals	8006 & 8012
6.	Diary date of Dak Section on both 1 <sup>st</sup> Appeals	28.01.19
7.	Diary date of 1 <sup>st</sup> Appeals in the office of FAA	28.01.2019
8.	Date of Hearing	19.02.2019

Appellant was heard over phone. Shri S.S. Rohilla, CPIO & DO to Chief IC and Shri H.P. Sen, CPIO & DO to IC(DP) were present.

Appellant has filed two first appeals against the reply of two CPIOs of the Commission in response to his same RTI application and on a similar matter, therefore, both the appeals are clubbed with.

**Decision with reasons:-**

2. Appellant submitted over phone that he sought certified photocopies of complaints/appeals filed by him in the Commission without annexure as per details given in the RTI application. Shri S.C. Sharma, CPIO had provided the information but Shri S.S. Rohilla, CPIO had denied to provide information by quoting Para-6 of a Commission's order No.CIC/AT/A/2006/00411 dated 05.12.2006 in the case of GPS Rana Vs Delhi Police and Shri H.P. Sen, CPIO had also denied to provide information by mentioning a High Court decision without quoting any reference.

3. Shri H.P. Sen, CPIO & DO to IC(DP) informed during the hearing that appellant has sought photocopies of his own documents and he denied to provide the same in the

P.T.O.

[ 2 ]

light of Madras High Court judgment dated 17.09.2014 in W.P.No.26781 of 2013 & M.P.No.1 of 2013 in which it was held that:-

"24. Insofar as query (iv) is concerned, we fail to understand as to how the second respondent is entitled to justify his claim for seeking the copies of his own complaints and appeals. It is needless to say that they are not the information available within the knowledge of the petitioner; on the other hand, admittedly, they are the documents of the second respondent himself, and therefore, if he does not have copies of the same, he has to blame himself and he cannot seek those details as a matter of right, thinking that the High Court will preserve his frivolous applications as treasures/valuable assets. Further, those documents cannot be brought under the definition "information" as defined under Section 2 (f) of the RTI Act. Therefore, we reject the contention of the second respondent in this aspect."

4. In view of the Commission's and Hon'ble Madras High Court's judgment quoted above by the CPIOs, FAA upheld the decision of the CPIOs.

5. The appeal is, therefore, disposed of.

6. 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 19<sup>th</sup> February 2019.

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

Copy to:-

Shri TBS Rajappa, CPIO, RTI Cell, CIC, New Delhi.

1  
Am  
19/02/19

