

Central Information Commission  
File No. CIC/SM/A/2009/000418 dated 22-07-2008  
Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (19)

Dated: 25 March 2010

Name of the Appellant : Shri R K Gupta  
X -3, Sector - 9,  
CBD Belapur,  
Navi Mumbai - 400 614.

Name of the Public Authority : CPIO, Bhabha Atomic Research  
Centre, Central Complex,  
3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, BARC, Trombay,  
Mumbai - 400 085.


The Appellant was present in person.

On behalf of the Respondent, Shri S. Govardhan, CPIO was present.


2. In this case, the Appellant had, in his application dated 22 July 2008, requested the CPIO for the lists of medically invalidated cases settled/not settled by the BARC'E FRS. In his reply dated 19 August 2008, and the CPIO provided the desired information. Not satisfied with the reply of the CPIO, the Appellant preferred an appeal on one September 2008. The appeal was disposed of in the order dated 28 September 2008. The Appellate Authority observed that the Appellant could also inspect the documents personally if he was not satisfied with the reply of the CPIO. Thereafter, the CPIO invited him to inspect the documents on 4 November 2008. After inspecting the documents, the Appellant, however, noted that he had been shown a few papers but the inspection had not been carried out. Later, he came to the CIC in second appeal.

3. We heard this case through videoconferencing. Both the parties were present in the Mumbai studio of the NIC. We heard their submissions. The Appellant was particularly offensive and needlessly aggressive in claiming that the information provided was incomplete without explaining in which way he found it inadequate. In spite of our repeated advice that he should clearly specify the inadequacies in the information provided to him, he persisted in delivering lectures on the role and responsibility of the

CIC/SM/A/2009/000418




Mr. SDM  
20/4




Information Commission and did not come out with any specific lacuna in the information provided by the CPIO. On the other hand, the Respondent submitted that both the lists had been provided in tabular format covering a large number of details about the individual employees and it was based entirely on the available records. We carefully examined the submissions of both the parties and, especially, the information provided. Since the Appellant had asked for only the lists of two sets of employees and the CPIO had provided it, we do not find, on the face of it, any inadequacy in the information. However, to satisfy the Appellant, we direct the CPIO to confirm to the Appellant within 10 working days from the receipt of this order by a sworn affidavit that apart from the details already provided by him earlier, there is nothing more to be provided by way of information regarding these two lists of employees.


4. With the above direction, the case is disposed off.
5. Copies of this order be given free of cost to the parties.

  
(Satyananda Mishra)  
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy. Additional copies of orders shall be supplied against application and payment of the charges prescribed under the Act to the CPIO of this Commission.

  
(Vijay Bhalra)  
Assistant Registrar



  
Mr. SD My Ado  
22/9/18