

# CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

(Room No.315, B-Wing, August Kranti Bhawan, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi 110 066)

**Prof. M. Sridhar Acharyulu (Madabhushi Sridhar)**

Information Commissioner

**CIC/SA/A/2014/901694**

**Mohit Hasija v. PIO, Indraprastha Institute of Information Technology**

Important Dates and time taken:

<b>RTI: ---</b>	<b>Reply: ---</b>	<b>Time: ---</b>
<b>FAA: ---</b>	<b>FAO: ---</b>	<b>Time: ---</b>
<b>SA: 10.11.2014</b>	<b>Hearing:23.04.2015</b>	<b>Decision: 28.04.2015</b>
<b>Result: Show cause issued.</b>		

## **Parties Present:**

1. None of the parties is present.

## **FACTS:**

2. Appellant through his RTI application sought for copies of the recommendation made by the institute recommending Madhur Hasija, Copy of the minutes of committee report of Madhur Hasija at the time of recommendation were made etc. PIO provided para wise reply. Being unsatisfied with PIO reply, the appellant made First Appeal. First Appellate Authority upheld the PIO reply. Claiming non-furnishing of information as per the RTI application, appellant approach the Commission through this present second appeal.

## **Proceedings Before the Commission:**

3. The Commission directs the respondent officer to provide separate copy of entire records pertaining to appointment of Mr. Madhu Hasija for Ph.D. in January, 2012 along with the recommendations made by the authorities and any other papers relating to fellowship including Fulbright fellowship, minutes of committee report, copies of SGPA and CGPA along with the comments of each members etc. The Commission do not agree with the contention of the respondent authority invoking Sec 8 (j), as the evaluation of Ph.D and other details were neither personal nor third party information. Appellant, the brother of the Madhu Hasija stated that his brother was in depression, and it is necessary to know such information for him. The public authority did not show any reason to disbelieve the statement of the appellant.

4. The Commission directs the respondent authority to furnish the information as directed above within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order and file compliance report before the Commission. The Commission also directs the PIO to show cause why maximum penalty cannot not be imposed against them for non-furnishing of complete information, and to be present before the Commission personally on 28.05.2015 at 2.30 p.m. to explain the illegal rejection of information.

Sd/-

(M.Sridhar Acharyulu)  
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(Babu Lal)  
Deputy Registrar

Addresses of the parties:

1. The CPIO under RTI,  
Indraprastha Institute of Information Technology,  
IIID Delhi, Okhla Industrial Estate, Ph-III,

New Delhi-110020.

2. Shri Mohit Hasija,  
H. No. 779, Sec-31, Urban Estate, Gurgaon,  
Haryana.