

Central Information Commission

Baba Gang Nath Marg,
Munirka, New Delhi -110067.

CIC/AA/A/2019/285
CICOM/A/2019/00186
CICOM/R/2019/00722

Name of the appellant: Shri Yogesh Malhotra,
S/o Late Shri C P Malhotra,
R/o A-285, Double Storey,
Kalkaji, New Delhi – 110019.

1.	Date of RTI application	23.09.2019
2.	Date of reply of the RTI application	21.10.2019
3.	CPIO(s) who furnished reply	CPIO, Sh. S S Rohilla, DO to CIC(SB)
4.	1 st Appeal Date	25.10.2019
5.	Diary No. of 1 st Appeal of the Dak Section	18636
6.	Diary date of 1 st Appeal in the office of FAA	29.10.2019
7.	Date of Decision	10.12.2019

Brief facts of the case:-

In the RTI application dated 23.09.2019, appellant is seeking information on 21 point. But the appellant desired questions wise information on question Nos. 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 & 17 in his first appeal filed in CIC. The requisite information is as under:-

Point No. 8:- “If the answer to Q. No. 6 is NO, then kindly clarify regarding the entry of Shri Bhavya Khanna & his colleagues on 13.09.2019 before Hon’ble Commissioner, Shri Sudhir Bhargava against above mentioned Appeal.

Point No. 11:- Can anybody enter into the hearing room of any Hon’ble Commissioner without letter of hearing? Kindly clarify.

Point No. 12:- If the answer to Q. No. 11 is NO, kindly reply in details regarding entry of Shri Bhavya Khanna and one of his colleagues into the room of Hon’ble Commissioner, Shri Sudhir Bhargava during hearing on the above mentioned three Appeals dated 13.09.2019 without letter of hearing.

Point No. 13:- Whether Shri Bhavya Khanna took permission in advance or takes permission on the same day from competent authorities to enter into the hearing room alongwith his colleagues? Kindly clarify.

(P.T.O.)

Point No. 14:- If the answer to Q. No. 13 is YES, kindly provide name & designation of the competent authorities?

Point No. 15:- Can Shri Bhavya Khanna argue on the above mentioned Appeal listed on 13.09.2019 before Hon'ble Commissioner, Shri Sudhir Bhargava in the absence of letter of hearing sent to him/memo of Appearance/VAKALATNAMA? Kindly clarify.

Point No. 16:- If the answer to Q. No. 15 is YES, kindly provide copy of bye-laws.

Point No. 17:- If the answer to Q. No. 15 is NO, then kindly provide under which section Shri Bhavya Khanna allowed to argue on the above mentioned Appeal listed before Hon'ble Commissioner Shri Sudhir Bhargava dated 13.09.2019. Kindly clarify.

2. Shri S S Rohilla, DR & CPIO, Registry of Chief IC(SB) provided point wise information to the appellant vide his reply dated 21.10.2019. The appellant not satisfied with the CPIO's reply with particulars point Nos. 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 & 17. Aggrieved with the reply, appellant filed the First Appeal in the Commission.

Decision with reasons:-

3. On going through the Appeal, it is observed that the Appellant is not satisfied with the information provided against point Nos.8,11,12,13,14,15,16 and 17. Item-wise reply of the CPIO has been gone through and it is observed that the CPIO has given appropriate reply as per record available. Therefore, I am in agreement with the reply of the CPIO.

4. No further intervention is required. The Appeal is disposed off.

5. 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 10th of December, 2019.

Shanti Priye Beck
(SHANTI PRIYE BECK)
Additional Secretary &
First Appellate Authority
Tel: 26162290

Copy to:-

Shri TBSJ Rajappa, CPIO, RTI Cell, CIC, New Delhi

