

PUBLIC GRIEVANCES COMMISSION

(Govt. of National Capital Territory of Delhi)

APPELLATE AUTHORITY

[Under Section 7, Delhi Right to Information Act, 2001]

Date of Hearing : 11.06.2018

Date of Decision :

Applicant : Sh. R.L.Makhija

Respondent : Dy. Commissioner (Rohini Zone)
North DMC, New Delhi

Appeal No : 612/2017

Appeal filed on : 5.12.2017

DRTI Application filed on : 25.10.2017

Competent Authority replied on : -

1 Background :

Sh. R.L.Makhija, the appellant vide DRTI application dated 25.10.2017 has sought information from the Competent Authority notified under the DRTI Act-2001, on total 16 points in respect of Sh. Sohan Lal (F.H.I) currently working in Rohini Zone.

The appellant did not receive any information from the Competent Authority i.e. The Deputy Commissioner, (Rohini Zone), North DMC. Hence, he filed an appeal before the Appellate Authority, Public Grievances Commission under Section 7 of DRTI Act -2001.

2 Proceedings

The appellant is present. Sh. Kuldeep APHI, Health, Rohini Zone, North DMC who is present on behalf of the Respondent/Competent Authority stated that the said application was received on 20th February 2018. However, from record it is seen that the appellant has submitted his application in the office of the Dy. Commissioner, Rohini Zone on 25.10.2017. The Competent Authority must ascertain the date on which the said application was received in the Office of the Dy. Commissioner, Rohini Zone, and find out the reasons/circumstances for delay in seeking information from all concerned and furnishing the same to the Competent Authority.

Further the reply of the department mentioned that Under Section 8 (1) (j) of the Right to Information Act, personal detail of employees cannot be given and hence no information has been provided to any of the queries except for no. 12. It is brought to the notice of the Competent Authority that Section 8 (1) (j) relates to the Right to

Information Acct 2005 whereas the appellant has sought information under the Delhi Right to Information Act, 2001. Therefore the reply is not acceptable.

3 Decision

A perusal of the record reveals that the application for seeking information was submitted to the Competent Authority on 25.10.2017 and the information was furnished to the appellant only on 1.6.2018 i.e. after lapse of over 07 months. Even this information is not satisfactory since none of the information sought attracts the provisions of "restriction clause".

The Competent Authority i.e. Dy. Commissioner Rohini Zone, North DMC is advised to furnish revised reply in respect of all the questions, except for no. 12, within 10 days of issue of this order directly to the appellant, with a copy to the Appellate Authority for information.

The reply should be furnished to the appellant under the signatures of Competent Authority, properly stamped, having the name of Competent Authority (documents, if any, appended with the reply should be certified either by the Competent Authority or an official deputed by the Competent Authority.

With the above directions the present appeal case is ordered to be closed in the Commission.

(SUDHIR YADAV)

Member,
Public Grievances Commission

Copy to :

- | | |
|--|---------------------|
| 1 Dy. Commissioner
Rohini Zone
Near Rajiv Gandhi Cancer
Institute, Sector-5, Rohini
New Delhi -110 085 | 2. Sh. R.I. Makhija |
|--|---------------------|