

Central Information Commission  
Baba Gang Nath Marg,  
Munirka, New Delhi – 110 067

CIC/AA/A/2020/28  
CICOM/A/E/20/00014  
CICOM/R/20/8/00007

Name of the Appellant: Sh. Rahul Kumar Mishra  
365, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Indira Vikas Colony,  
Mukharjee Nagar, New Delhi – 110 009

1.	Date of RTI application	03.01.2020
2.	Date of reply of the RTI application	08.01.2020
4.	CPIO (s) who furnished reply	Sh. T. B. J. S. Rajappa (CPIO, RTI Cell)
3.	1 <sup>st</sup> Appeal Date	21.01.2020
5.	Date of Decision	22.01.2020

**Brief Facts of the case:-**

1. In the online RTI application, the appellant has asked for following information:-
  - a) Please confirm me that is it necessary for a CPIO to mask or conceal the details of the author of such letters i.e., name designation which pertains to another department, at the time of furnishing the information.
  - b) If yes then provide me such decisions of CIC / Hon'ble Court in which it is mentioned.
  - c) If yes then provide me the documents which contains the particular condition in which it would be provided.
  - d) If no then please provide me such decisions of CIC/ Hon'ble Court in which it is mentioned.

**Reply of CPIO:-**

2. The information dated 08.01.2020, provided by Sh. T. B. J. S. Rajappa, CPIO (RTI Cell), as under:

"In this regard, it is to inform you that RTI Act, 2005 may be referred specifically section 10 and 11 along with other relevant sections for the desired information."

**Ground of First Appeal:-**

3. Aggrieved with reply of CPIO, Sh. T. B. J. S. Rajappa, RTI Cell, the appellant filed the First Appeal stated that

"Provided incomplete, misleading or false information. As the information provided by CPIO is not to the point. As the CIC is very responsible institution for implementation of RTI Act, it is not expected to give a illegible reply to the applicant. Hence, concerned first appellate authority is requested to give the reply each of my question into point form."

### Hearing of Appeal:-

4. The appellant was heard on 22.01.2020 over his mobile No. 837602416.

### Decision with reasons:-

5. On perusal of the Appeal, RTI application, CPIO's reply and hearing, it is observed that the appellant is seeking interpretation/comments of the CPIO on the decision taken by another CPIO while disposing an RTI application, which pertains to the discretion of the CPIO u/s 10 & 11 of RTI Act, 2005. CPIO, RTI Cell, CIC in his reply has rightly referred Section 10 and 11 of RTI Act, 2005. Hence, the reply given by the CPIO is factual and as per provision of the RTI Act, 2005. Therefore, further intervention is not required on the part of the FAA, in the matter.

6. The appeal is being disposed of accordingly.

7. 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 - 110 067 against this order within 90 days.

Dated January 22, 2020.



(Y. K. Singhal)

First Appellate Authority

Tel: 26162290

### Copy to:-

1.

2. Sh. T. B. J. S. Rajappa, RTI Cell, CIC, New Delhi.

*Handwritten notes:*  
23/1/20  
C

