



File No. CICOM/R/E/20/00669/2

Dated : 28.09.2020

To

**Sub: Providing information under RTI Act., 2005.**

Sir,

I am to refer to your online RTI application dated 09.09.2020 which has been registered vide no. CICOM/R/E/20/669/2. It has been received through online RTI MIS in Central Registry on 25.09.2020 from CPIO (RTI Cell) with the request to provide information on **Point 2** of said application. Accordingly available information is given below:-

- 1 Though queries has been raised which dehors section 2(f) of RTI Act, 2005 however for sake of transparency, it is stated as under.
  - (a) The appellant instead of attaching requisite mandatory documents, in accordance with Rule 8 of RTI Rules, 2012, against "Copy of RTI Application", "Copy of CPIO Reply", "Copy of First Appeal" and "Copy of First Appellate Authority Order", attached with his second appeal filed vide Dy. Nos. 684851/2020, a document namely, "final status of JUSTC/A/E/20/00120".
  - (b) Like-wise in another second appeal filed vide Dy. Nos. 684673/2020, the appellant attached "final status of DARPG/A/E/20/00125" against each of the "Copy of RTI Application", "Copy of CPIO Reply", "Copy of First Appeal" and "Copy of First Appellate Authority Order".
  - (c) Thus in accordance with Rule 9 of RTI Rules, 2012 said two second appeals were returned to the appellant, for resubmission, after removal of deficiencies, indicated in the Facilitation memo Dy. Nos. 684851/2020 and 684673/2020 each dated 09.09.2020 respectively.

- 2 Further as far as providing of hard copy of sought for documents, is concerned kind reference is invited to Para 24 of the Judgement dated 17.09.2014 delivered by Hon'ble Judges /coram: N. Paul Vasantha Kumar and K. Ravichandra Babu, JJ in W.P. No. 26781 of 2013 and M.P No. 1 of 2013 in the matter of the Public Information Officer Vs the Central Information Commission, of Hon'ble High Court of Madras, as reproduced below:-


***"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."***

P.T.O

Appeal, if any, against this reply will lie to **Ms. Meena Balimane Sharma**, First Appellate Authority, Room No 502. Baba Gang Nath Marg, Munirka, Near Old JNU Campus, New Delhi-110067 within 30 days of receipt of reply of the CPIO. Her Telephone no. is 011-26162290.

  
(Krishan Avtar Talwar)  
CPIO Central Registry - 1  
Tele. No. 011-26186536

Copy to: - The CPIO (RTI Cell), CIC, New Delhi.

  
29/9/20

  
(Krishan Avtar Talwar)  
CPIO Central Registry - 1

