

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

.....

F.No. CIC/AT/A/2006/00191
Dated, the 25th September, 2006.

Appellant: Shri Parveen Narang, C-68 Dayanand Colony, Lajpat Nagar-IV, New Delhi-110 024.

Respondents: Shri R.P. Upadhyaya, PIO, Dy. Commissioner of Police (Vigilance) Delhi Police, Police Bhavan, Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi-110 002.

Shri A.K. Sinha, Appellate Authority, Jt. Commissioner of Police(Vigilance), Delhi Police, Police Headquarters, IP Estate, New Delhi-110 002.

The appellant, Shri Parveen Narang has filed this appeal against the order dated 7.4.2006 of the Appellate Authority (AA), Shri A.K. Sinha, Jt. Commissioner of Police (Vigilance) upholding the order dated 2.3.2006 of the PIO, Shri R.P. Upadhyaya, Dy. Commissioner of Police (Vigilance).

Brief facts of the case are: the appellant has requested from the PIO disclosure of following information:

“WHAT ACTION HAS BEEN TAKEN W.R.T. MY COMPLAINT VIDE YOUR PUBLIC HEARING DIARY NO.9264/P.SEC./CP DATED 16.06.2005 TO JT. CP (VIGL/PHQ) MARKED TO DCP/VIGL/POLICE BHAWAN, ASIF ALI ROAD, NEW DELHI VIDE THEIR DIARY NO.5203/16.06.2005 REGARDING MY COMPLAINT AGAINST MR. KAUSHAL RAJ SHARMA, MR. SUNIL MITTAL, MR. VIKRAM JEET SINGH & MR RAMESH DAHIYA, THE THEN INCHARGE P.P. AMAR COLONY AND MR. JAI SINGH & MR. V.P. SINGH, THE THEN S.H.O./P.S. LAJPAT NAGAR FOR ABANDONMENT / DELAY OF INITIATIVE ACTION U/S 182 IPC, REGARDING BOGUS JHAGRA/BRIDE BURNING CALLS TO THE PCR AT “100’ NUMBER, AGAINST THE COMPLAINANT, BY SHRI OM PRAKASH SHARMA, R/O. B-92, LAJPAT NAGAR-I, FROM HIS TELEPHONE NO.691-7221. DESPITE DCP (SOUTH DISTT.) LETTER NO.1068/SD (C-1) DT.18.03.1999 & ENDST. NO.1281/SD(C-A) DT, 06.04.1999. COPY ENCLOSED [sic]. Please convey me the specific action taken and the official / officials against whom the same has been taken with a reference to letter no.14909/HA-SR/Vig./8.4.2003. Copy Enclosed. [sic]”

The PIO’s reply dated 2.3.2006 conveyed to the appellant “the gist of the vigilance enquiry report on your complaint...” and stated “Rest of the information cannot be furnished to you under the section 8(h) of Right to Information Act.”

Parties were called for a hearing today (i.e. 25.9.2006). The appellant was present in person, and the respondents were represented by the PIO, Smt. Shalini Singh, DCP (Vigilance), Delhi Police, successor to Shri R.P. Upadhyaya.

The respondent stated during the hearing which has also been conveyed through the AA's comments given in writing to the Commission, that the complaints of the appellant were enquired into and the Jt. Commissioner of Police (Vigilance) was informed that none of the Police officers at Police State level were found responsible for not initiating action under Section 182 IPC. However, as the copy of this letter addressed to the Jt. Commissioner of Police by the DCP (South District) was not endorsed to the local police / ACP Lajpat Nagar, the dealing hands in the DCP, South Office, namely, Omvir Singh, the then HAC/SD and HC Sunil Kumar (the then dealing hand) were found responsible for not communicating the decision dated 6.4.1999 of the DCP/South District to the SHO/Chowki Incharge. The show-cause notices for censure were being issued to both the above-named for their lapses.

The appellant stated that he did not agree with the conclusions arrived at by the Jt. Commissioner of Police and the Dy. Commissioner of Police absolving the officers at the Police Station level for failure to initiate action under Section 182 IPC following the appellant's complaint.

Quite clearly, the information which the appellant has been furnished reflects accurately and correctly the status of that information, viz. the conclusions arrived at on the basis of enquiry against certain Police officers. That the appellant does not agree with this conclusion is a different matter, and does not derogate from the fact that that was the conclusion of the Police authorities following enquiry. Now that this information is in the hands of the appellant, he is free to use it for grievance-redressal through a proper forum.

I, therefore, hold that the information supplied to the appellant corresponds to the request made by him.

The appeal is thus rejected.

Sd/-
(A.N. TIWARI)
INFORMATION COMMISSIONER

Authenticated by –

Sd/-
(L.C. SINGHI)
ADDL. REGISTRAR

Address of parties:

1. Shri Parveen Narang, C-68 Dayanand Colony, Lajpat Nagar-IV, New Delhi-110 024.
2. Smt. Shalini Singh, PIO, Dy. Commissioner of Police (Vigilance) Delhi Police, Police Bhavan, Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi-110 002.
3. Shri A.K. Sinha, Appellate Authority, Jt. Commissioner of Police (Vigilance), Delhi Police, Police Headquarters, IP Estate, New Delhi-110 002.
4. In-charge, NIC.
5. Press 'E' Group.