

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

Room No. – 308, 2nd Floor, August Kranti Bhawan,
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi – 110066.
Website: cic.gov.in

File No. CIC/CC/A/2015/002818/KY

Appellant : Shri Dilip H. Deshmukh
Suite-113-114, Level 1, Mastermind IV,
Royal Palms, Aarey Colony, Goregaon East, Mumbai-400065.

Public Authority : The Under Secretary & CPIO
M/o. Commerce & Industry, Dept. of Commerce,
Udyog Bhavan, New Delhi-110011

Date of Hearing : 04.01.2016

Date of Decision : 04.01.2016

Presence:

Appellant : Prem Prakash, Authorized by the appellant.

CPIO : Shri Saswati Bose, DGM & CPIO and Shri S.K. Samal, Jt. DGFT.

FACTS:

- I. Vide RTI application dated **09.12.2014**, the appellant sought information on sole issue.
- II. CPIO, vide its response dated **11.12.2014 & 24.11.2015**, reportedly provided the information to the appellant.
- III. The First Appeal (FA) was filed on **05.02.2015**, as desired information not provided.
- IV. First Appellate Authority (FAA), order is not on record.
- V. Grounds for the Second Appeal filed on **28.03.2015**, are contained in the Memorandum of Second Appeal.

HEARING

Appellant as well as respondent appeared before the Commission personally and made the submissions at length.

DECISION

It would be seen here that the appellant, vide his RTI Application dated **09.12.2014**, sought information from the respondents on **sole issue**. Respondents, vide their response dated **11.12.2014**, allegedly not provided the required information to the appellant. Being aggrieved by the aforesaid response, FA was filed by the appellant on **05.02.2015** before the FAA, who **could not take up** the same for its disposal **for the reasons best known to him**. Hence, a Second Appeal before this Commission.

STS-1069/RTI
8/1/2016

Sanjay

Rishabh
8/1/16

2. It is pertinent to mention here that the CPIO, vide his response dated 11.12.2014, transferred the appellant's RTI application to the concerned Public Authority for taking necessary action. Further, another CPIO vide his response dated 24.11.2015, provided the required information to the appellant on his RTI application dated 09.12.2014.
3. The Commission heard the submissions made by appellant as well as respondents at length. The Commission also perused the case-file thoroughly; specifically, nature of issues raised by the appellant in his RTI application dated 09.12.2014, respondent's response dated 11.12.2014 other material made available on record including respondent's written submissions dated 23.12.2015 and also the grounds of memorandum of second appeal.
4. In view of the position above and in the circumstances of the case, the Commission is of the considered view that the respondents have provided the required information to the appellant in terms of Section 2(f) of the RTI Act 2005. In view of this, the Commission feels that the appellant's second appeal becomes redundant in this regard. Thus, the appellant's second appeal deserves to be dismissed. Therefore, it is dismissed.

The Appeal is dismissed accordingly.

Sd/-

(M.A. Khan Yusufi)

Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy


(Krishan Avtar Talwar)
Deputy Registrar

✓ The Under Secretary & CPIO
M/o. Commerce & Industry, Dept. of Commerce,
Udyog Bhavan, New Delhi-110011

Shri Dilip H. Deshmukh
Suite-113-114, Level 1, Mastermind IV,
Royal Palms, Aarey Colony, Goregaon East, Mumbai-400065