

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

Club building, Opposite Ber Sarai Market, Old JNU Campus, New Delhi- 110067.

Tel: 011 - 26182593/26182594

Email: registryicab@gmail.com

File No: CIC/CC/A/2015/002300

In the matter of:

Shri Krishna Kant Upadhyay GS192902, OEM, 158 FCP/71 RCC C/o 99 APO, Pin-930071

...Appellant

Vs.

Central Public information Officer M/o Defence

Headquarters, Chief Engineer Project, Pushpak, Pin-931711, C/o 99 APO

....Respondent

Dates

RTI application : 27.12.2014

CPIO reply : 30.01.2015

First Appeal : 23.02.2015

FAA Order : Not on record

Second Appeal : 10.03.2015

Date of hearing : 23.09.2016

Information sought:

The appellant had sought details relating to pension.

Grounds for Second Appeal:

The CPIO did not provide the desired information.

Order

Appellant : Absent

Respondent : CPIO, Shri Wagalave, Sr.Adm.Officer

he CPIO submitted during the course of hearing that the appellant had filed the RTI application in a routine manner & not for seeking any particular information.

Or perusal of record it is seen that the CPIO submitted that Border Roads Organisation is an executive arm of the Border Roads Development Board which is included in the IInd Schedule u/s 24 (1) of the RTI Act & hence it is exempted under the Act. He further submitted that the appellant is in the habit of submitting RTI application frequently, seeking various informations regarding service grievances and creating hypothetical stories of allegation of corruption against the organisation as well as its officers without submitting any prima facie proof/valid documents. He has been using the RTI Act as a tool for blackmailing/harassing the officers of the public authority in a routine manner. All the information available with the PIO of the project had already been provided to the appellant. The CPIO relied on the decision of the coordinate bench of the Commission in CIC/CC/A/14/000761/DP where the Commission held as follows:

"All personnel serving in the organisation may be made aware of RTI provisions. Special mention has to be made to them that for service related documents they shouldn't approach CPIO/FAA/CIC under RTI Act unless it is a case of violation of human rights and allegations of corruption. It will save the time and energy of the personnel and the organisation both"

It is relevant to note that the appellant was not present to explain how the information sought by him was related to the allegation of corruption or human rights violation. The Commission finds no ground to interfere with the respondent's reply.

In view of the above, the Commission upholds the reply of the CPIO as just and proper. The appeal is disposed of accordingly.

W

1700/25

[Amitava Bhattacharyya] Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(A.K.Tarapatra) Dy. Registrar स्थान अस्ति **२** मतुभाग प्रभाते **2** 26/1. 14/2. 24 Coud [R-1]