

केन्द्रीय सूचना आयोग
Central Information Commission
बाबा गंगनाथ मार्ग, मुनिरका
Baba Gangnath Marg, Munirka
नई दिल्ली New Delhi – 110067

द्वितीय अपील संख्या / Second Appeal No. **CIC/NFCOM/A/2021/699029**

Shri G Praveen Kumar

... अपीलकर्ता/Appellant

VERSUS/बनाम

PIO, Nuclear Fuel Complex, Department of Atomic Energy, Hyderabad
Through: Smt. Lakshmi Devi – PIO and Shri Ravikumar-APIO

...प्रतिवादीगण /Respondent

Date of Hearing : 21.07.2022

Date of Decision : 22.07.2022

Chief Information Commissioner : Shri Y. K. Sinha

Relevant facts emerging from appeal:

RTI application filed on : 14.09.2020
PIO replied on : 17.10.2020
First Appeal filed on : 30.10.2020
First Appellate Order on : 08.12.2020
2ndAppeal/complaint received on : 07.01.2021

Information sought and background of the case:

The Appellant filed an online RTI application dated 14.09.2020 and the CPIO/Industrial Relations Officer, Nuclear Fuel Complex, Department of Atomic Energy, Hyderabad, vide letter dated 17.10.2020 replied as under: -

Sl. No.	Information sought	Information furnished
1	I received a complaint from asovig@nfc.gov.in regarding illegal activities in Quarter No.B-1/2 through proper channel please provide me the complainant and action taken against the complaint and complete details.	Copy of the complaint is attached. The complaint was forwarded to ECIL and the information on the action taken is not available in this office.

Dissatisfied with the response received from the CPIO, the Appellant filed a First Appeal dated 30.10.2020. The FAA/Chief Administrative Officer, Nuclear Fuel Complex, Department of Atomic Energy, Hyderabad, vide order dated 08.12.2020 upheld the reply of the CPIO.

Aggrieved and dissatisfied, the Appellant approached the Commission with the instant Second Appeal.

Facts emerging in Course of Hearing:

A written submission has been received from CPIO vide letter signed on 15.07.2022 whereby the Respondent has reiterated the factual position.

Hearing was scheduled through video conference after giving prior notice to both the parties. Respondent alone attended the virtual hearing, while the Appellant has not attended the hearing nor communicated any reason for his absence despite service of hearing notice in advance. The Respondent reiterated the response already provided to the Appellant.

Decision:

Upon perusal of the facts of the case, it is noted that information available in official records, as defined under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act, had been duly provided to the Appellant. Moreover, the Appellant has neither appeared for the hearing nor sent any submission to buttress his case despite service of hearing notice. Since the information as available with the Respondent stands disseminated, no further cause of action subsists under the RTI Act. Hence, the Commission is of the considered opinion that no fruitful purpose will be served by prolonging adjudication of this case.

The instant Appeal is disposed off accordingly, with no further direction.

Y. K. Sinha (वाई. के. सिन्हा)
Chief Information Commissioner (मुख्य सूचना आयुक्त)

Authenticated true copy
(अभिप्रमाणित सत्यापित प्रति)

S. K. Chitkara (एस. के. चिटकारा)
Dy. Registrar (उप-पंजीयक)
011-26186535