

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
Club Building (Near Post Office)
Old JNU Campus, New Delhi - 110067
Tel: +91-11-26161796

Decision No. CIC/SG/A/2010/000245/7135

Appeal No. /SG/A/2010/000245

Relevant Facts emerging from the Appeal:

Appellant : Dr. Himmat Rao Ratnoo
26-E, Mahanadi Extension, Jawaharlal Nehru University,
New Delhi - 1100067

Respondent : Mr. Jit Singh
Public Information Officer & Dy. Registrar
O/o the Public Information Officer,
DR (SC/ST Cell) Room No.133,
SC/ST Cell (Admin. Blcok),
Jawaharlal Nehru University,
New Delhi-110067.

RTI application filed on : 30/09/2009
PIO replied : 21/10/2009
First appeal filed on : 26/11/2009
First Appellate Authority order : No Order
Second Appeal received on : 25/01/2010
Notice of Hearing Sent on : 09/02/2010
Hearing Held on : 12/03/2010

Information sought:

The Appellant seeks information separately and individually with respect to each of the ten annexures enclosed with the RTI Application..

1. Daily progress made on each of the documents.
2. Names and designations of the officials with whom the documents were lying from January to September, 2009 and the actions taken thereon
3. Proof of receipt and despatch of the documents in the offices of above officials
4. In how many days should such matter be dealt with and responded to? Copy of the rules stating the same.
5. Are the officials guilty of violating the rules regarding time limits? Consequently, a copy of their conduct rules so violated
6. Are the officials guilty of causing mental harassment to the public?
7. What and by when action can be taken against these officials for violation of the rule?

Reply of PIO:

1. E- mail receipt's veracity cannot be confirmed as Prof. R.K. Sharma did not maintain personal record of all emails sent to him. No action need be taken by Chairperson on e-mail submissions.
2. Email receipt cannot be confirmed as since Prof. Kundu did not maintain personal record of all emails sent to him. Supervisor need not act on email submissions by supervisee unless the latter personally meets the former.
3. Same as in 2.
4. Receipt not confirmed in words. No action need be taken by the supervisor until the supervisee meets the former personally.
5. Same as in 2.
6. Same as in 4.
7. Same as in 2.
8. Not processed. Supervisee needs to personally get his progress report and bills duly verified and forwarded by the supervisor.
9. Reply sent to Registrar, JNU, that the applicant had not met supervisor for several months. Hence, claims could not be forwarded or endorsed by the Centre.

10. Not processed. Supervisee needs to meet the supervisor and get the claims endorsed and forwarded to the Chairperson.

First Appeal:

Information by the PIO not provided separately and individually to each of the ten documents.

Order of the FAA:

No Order

Ground of the Second Appeal:

Ground for First Appeal and no order passes by FAA.

Relevant Facts emerging during Hearing:

The following were present:

Appellant: Absent;

Respondent: Mr. Jit Singh, Public Information Officer & Dy. Registrar; Prof. V. K. Jain, FAA & Registrar;

The Appellant has sent a letter to the Commission stating that his petition should be treated as a complaint under Section 18 of the RTI Act. He has filed a first appeal and is claiming that a point-wise reply was not given to him and that he was not satisfied with the information provided. Since the appellant has filed a first appeal on 26/11/2009 which he has included, the Commission is treating this as a second appeal. According to the Appellant the FAA has not passed any order. The Appellant has been unwilling to appear before the FAA Prof. V. K. Jain. The appellant also claims that his salary has been stopped and that he is being victimized

A perusal of the information provided by the Appellant himself indicates that the information has been provided to him.

Decision:

The appeal is dismissed.

The information appears to have 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