

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

Decision No.CIC/SG/A/2010/000174/7036
Appeal No. CIC/SG/A/2010/000174

Appellant : Mr. Saeed Ahmed
S/o Late Sh.Ali Ahmed,
6916/XIV, Ground Floor,
Chowk Ahata Kidara,
Gali Gondhi Wali,
Delhi - 110006.

Respondent : Mr. Abdul Dayyan
Public Information Officer &
Assistant Director
Slum & JJ Department
Municipal Corporation of Delhi Room
No.8, Punarvas Bhawan,
I.P. Estate New Delhi - 110002.

RTI application filed on : 19/01/2009
PIO replied : 11/02/2009
First Appeal filed on : 27/02/2009
First Appellate Authority order : 26/03/2009
Second Appeal Received on : 22/01/2009
Notice of Hearing Sent on : 01/02/2010
Hearing Held on : 05/03/2010

Information sought:

Appellant sought certified copy regarding Tenancy Substitution of property No. 6916/XIV, (Ground Floor), Gali Gali Gondhi, Chowk Ahata Kidara, Delhi-06, which had been deposited by him on 20/01/1992.

PIO's Reply:

“As per the record available in property file bearing no. TS/EP/6916/xiv/98/69-70 the required documents are not available.”

Grounds for First Appeal:

Unsatisfactory reply.

Appellant asked that if the same documents are not available then why no action had been taken and tenancy in his name was pending reason thereof.

Order of the First Appellate Authority:

“The Departmental Officer informed that the copies of the documents which are available in the record have already been given to him. The documents which he has asked are not available in the Deptt. The Appellant informed that that he should be given the documents which are available in another file. He was advised that for this he may apply again.

The Appellant may also inspect the record connected with this case on 30/03/2009”

Grounds for Second Appeal:

Documents sought by the Appellant had not been provided.

Relevant Facts emerging during Hearing:

The following were present

Appellant: Mr. Saeed Ahmed;

Respondent: Mr. Abdul Dayyan, Public Information Officer & Assistant Director;

The Appellant claims that he had submitted an affidavit in 1992 to the Department from his father and mother. The PIO states that inspite of all the efforts put by him this document has not been located in the Department's file. In view of this he is unable to provide a photocopy of the said document to the Appellant.

Decision:

The appeal is disposed.

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
05 March 2010

(In any correspondence on this decision, mention the complete decision number.)^{Reg}