

Central Information Commission

Mr.Krishna Kumar Singh vs Ministry Of Railways on 25 January, 2011

In the Central Information Commission  
at  
New Delhi

File No: CIC/AD

Date of Hearing : January 25, 2011

Date of Decision : January 25, 2011

Parties:

Applicant

Shri Krishankumar Singh  
101, Somvansham  
R.J.Nagar  
Fulpada Road  
Virar East,  
Thane

The Applicant was present at NIC Studio, Mumbai.

Respondents

Western Railway  
Divisional Railway Manager's Office  
Mumbai Central  
Mumbai 400 008

Represented by : Ms.Rekha Yadav, PIO & Sr.DPO and Shri A.K.Jha, Appellate A  
Studio, Mumbai

Information Commissioner : Mrs. Annapurna Dixit

-----

Decision Notice

As given in the decision

In the Central Information Commission  
at  
New Delhi

ORDER

Background

1

The Applicant filed an RTI application dt.5.3.10 with the PIO, DRM Office, Western Railway, Mumbai.

He stated that he is working in HBCDTS and that despite the Order of the Court, the attendant benefits have not been given to him even after 3 years after the judgment. He added that in this connection, he had lodged a complaint and that no response was received by him. Besides this he also sought information relating to his seniority and pay fixation. On not receiving any reply, the Applicant filed an appeal dt.23.4.10 with the Appellate Authority reiterating his request for the information.

Shri Anil Kumar Jha, Appellate Authority replied on 2.6.10 stating that information as available in material form can be provided and that Applicant has sought answers to questions prefixed with 'why', 'what', 'when', 'where' etc. Being aggrieved with the reply, he Applicant filed a second appeal dt.10.8.10 before CIC.

Decision

2

During the hearing, the Appellant submitted that he is only in knowing whether seniority is one of the components of the attendant benefits mentioned para 1 haereinabove.

M s . R e k h a Y a d a v , R e s p o n d e n t P I O submitted that though the Appellant had not sought this information in his RTI application she is willing to hold a personal hearing with the Appellant and provide the required clarification.

3. In view of the Respondent's assurance that the Appellant's grievance will be looked into, the Commission holds that there is no further obligation on the part of the PIO, to provide any further information and accordingly closes the case at the Commission's end.

(Annapurna Dixit) Information Commissioner Authenticated true copy (G.Subramanian)  
Deputy Registrar Cc:

1. Shri Krishankumar Singh 101, Somvansham R.J.Nagar Fulpada Road Virar East, Thane

2. The Public Information Officer Western Railway Divisional Railway Manager's Office  
Mumbai Central Mumbai 400 008

3. The Appellate Authority Western Railway Divisional Railway Manager's Office Mumbai Central  
Mumbai 400 008

4. Officer Incharge, NIC