

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

Appeal No.2964/ICPB/2008

F. No. PBA/2008/00763

October 27, 2008

In the matter of Right to Information Act, 2005 – Section 19

[Hearing on 15.10.2008 at 11.30 a.m.]

Appellant: Mr. Lalit Chandranahu

Public authority: Food Corporation of India
Mr. B.K. Philip, DGM & CPIO

Parties Present: For Respondent:
Mr. B.K. Philip, DGM
Mr. M. Bhullar, Area Manager

Appellant not present.

DECISION

The appellant has sought information under RTI Act by his application dated 20.11.2006 addressed to Food Corporation of India, Raipur seeking certain information regarding purchase of rice etc. Though the application is dated 20.11.2006 for which he has received final reply only on 22.11.2007. The appellant has also filed an appeal on 1.12.2007 for which he has not received any reply from the First AA. This has resulted in filing of this appeal before the Commission on 3.5.2008. The Commission called for comments from public authority vide letter dated 21.7.2008 for which some reply has been received on 4.8.2008. The Assistant PIO, FCI has also forwarded the information which he has furnished on 4.8.2008 to the party concerned by indicating the quantum of rice procured from the miller. The APIO has given information regarding quantum of storage loss for the year 2000-2006 year-wise manner. However, it is noticed the appellant has not indicated whether he requires this information for paddy or rice whether it is paddy/rice procured by FCI or State Govt. and in case if he can specify his request the PIO will be directed to provide the information immediately. The PIO has also stated that a copy of the comments which they have submitted to the Commission on 4.8.2008 has also been endorsed to the appellant.

2. This case was taken up for hearing on 15.10.2008, which was attended by the DGM and Area Manager, Raipur. I have gone through the RTI application and other replies received in this connection. It has been noticed by the Commission there was delay in responding to this application. However, it was

brought to the notice of the Commission to collect this information from the State Government and provide it to the appellant. This cannot be accepted. They should have provided whatever information they had with them initially and they take further steps in collecting the information so that the appellant would have received some information and he will not file first appeal and second appeal and he will not make a complaint before the Commission. It is once again reiterated both the CPIOs and AAs are designated authorities under RTI Act and they should adhere to the time-frame in future, while giving reply to RTI application. Otherwise action will be proceeded under section 20(1) of RTI Act. This should be noted very strictly in future. On the above lines, the appeal is disposed of.

Let a copy of this decision be sent to the appellant and CPIO.

Sd/-
(Padma Balasubramanian)
Central Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy :

(Prem Singh Sagar)
Under Secretary & Assistant Registrar

Address of parties :

1. Mr. B.K. Philip, DGM & CPIO, District Office, Madina Manzil, Jail Road, Raipur (CG)
2. Mr. Lalit Chandranahu, Station Marg, Mahasmund, Jila-Mahasmund, (CG).