

RTI APPEAL DETAILS (आरटीआई अपील विवरण)		
Appeal Registration Number (अपील पंजीकरण संख्या) :	IFCIL/A/E/24/00017	RTI Appeal Received Date (आरटीआई अपील प्राप्त की तिथि) : 23/05/2024
RTI Request Registration No. (आरटीआई अनुरोध पंजीकरण संख्या):	IFCIL/R/E/24/00022	RTI Request Registration Date (आरटीआई अनुरोध पंजीकरण की तारीख) : 24/04/2024
Name (नाम) :	[REDACTED]	Gender (लिंग) : Male
Address (पता) :	[REDACTED]	
Pin code (पिन कोड) :	[REDACTED]	
State (राज्य) :	[REDACTED]	Country (देश) : India
Phone Number (फोन नंबर) :	Details not provided	Mobile Number (मोबाईल नंबर) : [REDACTED]
Email-ID (ईमेल-आईडी) :	[REDACTED]	
Status (स्थिति) :	Urban	Educational Status (शैक्षणिक स्थिति) : Above Graduate
Citizenship Status (नागरिकता) :	Indian	Is Appellant Bellow Poverty Line ? (क्या अपील करनेवाला गरीबी रेखा से नीचे का है?) : No
CPIO Approached (संपर्क सीपीआईओ) :	38570	Date of Receipt of CPIO's Order/Decision(सीपीआईओ के आदेश / निर्णय के रसीद की तारीख) : Details not provided
CPIO's Order/Decision No. (सीपीआईओ का आदेश / निर्णय संख्या) :	Details not provided	
Ground for Appeal(अपील का आधार) :	Provided Incomplete,Misleading or False Information	
Text of RTI First Appeal (आरटीआई प्रथम अपील का पाठ) :	<p>This appeal is preferred against the disposal made by the CPIO vide his reply dated 20/05/2024</p> <p>1. The CPIO ought to have specified the relevant regulation/rule no by which the Competent Authority is empowered to withhold/delay/deny the retiral benefits. Instead of specifying the Relevant Regulation No of the relevant guidelines which is information held within the meaning of information under the RTI Act, the CPIO has just forwarded the Gratuity Regulations / pension regulations without specifying the relevant regulation Number. This has been done with a mischievous intention .</p>	

Hence the FAA is requested to direct the CPIO to specify the Relevant rule/ Regulation No

2. As far as invocation of Section 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act is concerned , the CPIO again has failed to apply the provisions of the RTI Act in lines with its objectives and purposes. It appears that the CPIO either did not apply his mind or understand the straight forward information sought by the Appellant. At item 3 and 4 the following information was sought.

Pl specify the total number of cases in which the retiral benefits were withheld from the year 2020.

Pl specify the grade of the officer and the grade and designation of the Competent Authority in respect of item 3

A cursory glance of the information sought would reveal that the Appellant has not sought any personal details of any officer. All that that has been sought by the Appellant is the number of cases and the grade of the officers

I fail to understand as to how the CPIO has come to the conclusion that it would invade the personal privacy. If no personal information is sought, there can be no question of personal privacy being invaded.

I have to state that as the CPIO is unable to decipher the distinction between Personal information and statistical numbers , he has been continuously misapplying the exemption clauses and is denying the information held by the Public Authority in a wrongful manner.

Further the CPIO is not justified in concluding that the information sought has no relationship with public activity or interest. In my view this determination of whether the information sought has any relationship with public interest or not is a function usually done by the Central Information Commission and/or Judiciary. Hence the CPIO has travelled beyond his limited powers and exceeded his powers by usurping the Judicial powers.

In view of the FAA may like to peruse the Original RTI Application, the Reply of the CPIO and this Appeal and may like to direct the submission of the information sought as it can be clearly seen that no personal information has been sought of any individual officer