In the matter of:
Baljeet Singh

VS

Central Public Information Officer
Central University of Haryana
Vill. - Jaat Pali, Mahendergarh – 123029 (Haryana)

Appellant

Respondent

RTI application filed on : 26/04/2019
CPIO replied on : 30/05/2019
First appeal filed on : 07/06/2019
First Appellate Authority order : 09/07/2019
Second Appeal dated : 22/07/2019
Date of Hearing : 24/06/2020
Date of Decision : 24/06/2020

The following were present:

Appellant: Present over phone
Respondent: Shri Kulwant Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Law and CPIO, present over phone

Information Sought:
The appellant has sought the following information:
1. Copy of the Minutes of 24th Meeting of the Executive Council.
2. Copy of the Minutes of 25th Meeting of the Executive Council.
3. Copy of the Minutes of Meetings of the Committee constituted for considering promotions, held from 01 January 2018 to 30 April 2019, for considering promotion/selection of non-teaching staff (posts).
4. How many posts of MTS are lying vacant and how many have been filled up.
5. Provide copies of the resignations letters submitted by persons working as MTS.
6. And various other information.

Grounds for filing Second Appeal
The CPIO has provided incomplete information.

Submissions made by Appellant and Respondent during Hearing:
The appellant submitted that he is not satisfied with the reply of the CPIO and pressed for information in respect of points no.3,6,7,8,9 and 12 of the RTI application.
The CPIO contended that in respect of point no. 3 the appellant had sought copy of the Minutes of Meetings of the Committee constituted for considering promotions, held from 01 January 2018 to 30 April 2019, for considering promotion/selection of non-teaching staff (posts). He clarified that both the minutes are different documents i.e Selection Committee Minutes and Minutes relating to promotion. He was advised during the hearing to give both the documents. In respect of point no. 6 and 8 the CPIO reiterated the earlier reply. In respect of point no.7, he mentioned that Acting Vice Chancellor acts as per the norms of UGC and no such specific document in available with them. In respect of points no. 9 & 12 he reiterated the earlier reply and relied on the FAA order dated 09.07.2019 in which the information sought in both the points were denied u/s 8(1)(g) of the RTI Act.

Observations:
Having heard both the parties, it was noted that the CPIO should provide a revised reply as discussed above in respect of point no. 3. In respect of points no. 6 & 8, no specific time period was mentioned and the CPIO reply is correct due to the fact that no such record is maintained in the desired format in respect of a particular Acting Vice Chancellor. In respect of point no. 7 the appellant in the garb of seeking information is raising a grievance and the CPIO should have categorically denied it instead of asking him to seek information from UGC. In respect of points no. 9 & 12 of the RTI application, the CPIO erred in stating that no information was asked, whereas the information sought was specific and it is relevant to mention that right to information includes right to inspect also. The FAA however ,rightly denied the information stating the same to be related to third parties, however, the denial clause applicable is Sec 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act and not Sec 8(1)(g) of the Act as mentioned.
Decision:

In view of the above observations, the CPIO is directed to provide a revised reply to the appellant in respect of point no. 3 of the RTI application, within 3 days from the date of issue of this order via e-mail as well as speed post.

The appeals are disposed of accordingly.
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