

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

Decision No.CIC/SG/A/2010/000222/7129
Appeal No. CIC/SG/A/2010/000222

Appellant : Mr. Rishipal Singh Tomer,
H.No.-100, Gali No.-2, Block-C,
Prem Nagar, Najafgarh,
New Delhi-110043

Respondent : Mrs. Shukla Malhotra
Public Information Officer & DDE(W-B)
O/o the Dy. Director of Education,
District West B,
Directorate of Education
Govt. of NCT of Delhi,
G-Block, Vikaspuri, New Delhi

RTI application filed on : 27/07/2009
PIO replied : 04/09/2009
First Appeal filed on : 07/10/2009
First Appellate Authority order : Not mentioned
Second Appeal Received on : 19/01/2010
Notice of Hearing Sent on : 09/02/2010
Hearing Held on : 12/03/2010

Sl.	Information Sought	PIO's reply
i.	What was the reason that without any objection in writing the file has returned to school after 4 month on date 30/05/2009.	Due to shortage of staff, the file could not be dealt within time.(O.S Admin) was to deal with the file.
ii.	Was there any objection on his ACP II case file than ... has not returned immediately to H.O.S of the school ... objection could be remove.	
iii.	What action will be initiated against the official who responsible for the negligence? Will the responsibility by the DDE Distt West B G. Block, Vikaspuri, Delhi.	There was no official to deal with hence no action can be taken.
iv.	Due to the neglency of office of the DDE Dist-west-B, the appellant is being suffered form financial loss and other beeift. Will the official of the Distt-West-B be share this loss?	There is no financial loss to the applicant as he ACP will be granted with retrospective effect.
v.	What is the status of his ACP Case (I) today.	The case of he applicant has already been sent to ACP... consideration vide No. DDE/WB/Admin 2009/706 dated 20/08/2009
vi.	Name & designation of the officer of the Directorate of Education to who the Appellant could proceed with this matter for the responsibility and suitable action in this case?	<i>No reply.</i>

Grounds for First Appeal:
Information was not provided.

Order of the First Appellate Authority:
Not enclosed.

Grounds for Second Appeal:
Incomplete information.

Relevant Facts emerging during Hearing:

The following were present:

Appellant: Mr. Rishipal Singh Tomer;

Respondent: Mrs. Shukla Malhotra, Public Information Officer & DDE(W-B);

The Appellant states that he was given information to his RTI application dated 27/07/2009 on 04/09/2009. The RTI application has been transferred and hence the PIO received the RTI application on 05/08/2009. The PIO shows evidence that the information was sent on 04/09/2009 but the appellant claims that he did not receive this information. He states that he received it by hand only on 13/11/2009. The instances where PIO's claim that they have sent letters by UPC and Appellants claims that they have not received it are fairly large. The Commission therefore recommends to the Public Authority to send RTI replies by Speed Post. This recommendation has been given under the powers given to the Commission under Section 25(5) of the RTI Act.

Decision:

The appeal is disposed.

The information has been provided to the Appellant.

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
12 March 2010

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