

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
Club Building, Opposite Ber Sarai Market,
Old JNU Campus, New Delhi - 110067.
Tel: +91-11-26161796

Decision No.CIC/SG/A/2009/003225/6697
Appeal No. CIC/SG/A/2009/003225

Appellant : Mr. Vinesh Kawatra
11/137, Malviaya Nagar,
New Delhi - 110017

Respondent : Mr. Mr. M.K.Singla
APIO & Ex. En. Works [II] SZ,
Office of the Ex. En- [II]
MCD, (SZ), Green Park,
New Delhi.

RTI application filed on : 11/08/2009
PIO replied : 11/09/2009
First Appeal filed on : 11/09/2009
First Appellate Authority order : 27/10/2009
Second Appeal filed on : 24/12/2009
Notice of Hearing Sent on : 05/01/2010
Hearing Held on : 04/02/2010

Information sought:

Appellants seek information as follows:

1. Is it true that MCD sought remission from forest department for removal of 14 trees from middle of the service road in between parks 4,5,9,10,11 in Malviya Nagar?
2. Is it true that 11 trees were chopper by the MCD & three were left only due to operational reasons & in the meantime the sanction period of 45 days expired?
3. Is it true that MCD never appeals to forest department for reversal of said permission?
4. is it true that MCD repeatedly & repeatedly asked for permission for cutting of left over three trees from forest department from the last more than 5 years?
5. Is it true that MCD fully committed to its moral as well as legal obligation to provide obstruction free road around the park to all residents
6. Is it true that MCD has never decided in its wisdom not to cut the said trees from the middle of road?
7. Is it true that MCD being sole owner of land never consult by forest department in reversing the said permission?
8. Is it true that MCD stands by its earlier statement sent to forest department
9. Is it true that MCD consider "the demand of removing this "road block" is a justified demand of residents & MCD is committed to remove it as soon as permission from competent authority is granted
10. Is it true that MCD after removing 11 trees from the road carpeted the service of road in Jan.2008 but the erring residence of 5/65 planted trees newly carpeted road?

PIO's reply

The PIO gave point wise reply to the appellant on 11/09/2009;

Grounds for First Appeal:

No reply of PIO

Order of the First Appellate Authority:

PIO directed to furnish the information within 10 days

Grounds for Second Appeal:

No reply of PIO till date.

Relevant Facts emerging during Hearing:

The following were present:

Appellant: Mr. Vinesh Kawatra;

Respondent: Mr. Mr. M.K.Singla, APIO & Ex. En. Works [II] SZ;

The PIO has provided information based on records. The appellant is seeking interpretations and clarifications of certain actions by MCD. This is not information as defined under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act.

Decision:

The appeal is dismissed.

This decision is announced in open chamber.

Notice of this decision be given free of cost to the parties.

Any information in compliance with this Order will be provided free of cost as per Section 7(6) of RTI Act.

Shailesh Gandhi
Information Commissioner
04 February 2010

(In any correspondence on this decision, mention the complete decision number.)

(SR)