

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

**Decision No.CIC/SG/A/2010/000198/7141**  
**Appeal No. CIC/SG/A/2010/000198**

**Appellant** : Mr. Amer Singh Dunta  
827/1 Sirmor Marg,  
Rajender Nagar,  
Dehradun.

**Respondent** : Mr. Manoj Chauhan  
Public Information Officer  
**Hemwati Nandan Bahuguna**  
**Garhwal University, (MHRD)**  
Srinagar (Uttarakhand).

**RTI application filed on** : 04/09/2009  
**PIO replied** : 19/12/2009  
**First Appeal filed on** : 12/11/2009  
**First Appellate Authority order** : 04/12/2009  
**Second Appeal Received on** : 20/01/2010  
**Notice of Hearing Sent on** : 16/02/2010  
**Hearing Held on** : 15/03/2010

**Information sought:**

1. Can those students of Arts stream who had passed XIIth with Home Science as one of the subjects get the degree of B.Sc Home Science?
2. What subjects required in XIIth class to get the degree of B.Sc. Home Science.
4. In year 2006-07, 2007-08 and 2008-09. How many students have got the degree in B.Sc. Home Science who has passed XIIth with Arts Stream?
5. In year 2009-10 how many students have got the degree in B.Sc. Home Science? Who had passed XIIth with Science Stream & Arts Stream?

**Reply of PIO:**

Appellant received the information vide letter No..... /558/2009/929 dated 19/12/2009.

**Grounds for First Appeal:**

Non-receipt of the information from the PIO.

**Order of the First Appellate Authority:**

The FAA directed the PIO to ensure that the information be given within mandated time. The FAA further directed the PIO to provide the information to the Appellant within two weeks. The PIO was also asked to reproduce the file so that the responsibility of the officer could be fixed under Section 5 (4) & (5).

**Grounds for Second Appeal:**

Appellant is not satisfied with the reply of Point no. 1, 2, 4, 5, & 6.

**Relevant Facts emerging during Hearing:**

The following were present:

**Appellant:** Absent;

**Respondent:** Mr. Manoj Chauhan, Public Information Officer;

The Appellant has primarily sought answers to hypothetical situations and effectively interpretation of rule and laws. The PIO has not understood this and has forwarded the RTI Application to the number of officers and then tried to provide some kind of reply to the Appellant. Since no information has been sought there is really no record based on which information could have been provided.

**Decision:**

The appeal is disposed.

No information as defined under Section 2(f) has been sought.

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**  
**15 March 2010**

*(In any correspondence on this decision, mention the complete decision number.)<sup>(AK)</sup>*