

Central Information Commission, New Delhi
File No.CIC/SM/A/2011/001511
Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (19)

Date of hearing : **19 March 2013**

Date of decision : **19 March 2013**

Name of the Appellant : **Shri Viresh Kumar Choubey,**
Advocate, Civil Line,
Lalitpur, U.P.

Name of the Public Authority : **CPIO, Allahabad High Court,**
Allahabad, U.P.

The Appellant was present.

On behalf of the Respondent, the following were present:-

- (i) Shri Rakesh Mishra, CPIO,
- (ii) Shri Tripathi

Chief Information Commissioner : **Shri Satyananda Mishra**

2. Both the parties were present in the respective NIC studios. We heard their submissions.

3. The Appellant had sent some complaints to the Allahabad High Court. He had wanted to know about the action taken on those complaints. The CPIO had informed him that the Administrative Judge had ordered to file the complaints obviously without any further action. The Appellant had preferred an

appeal against this order. The Appellate Authority had dismissed the appeal.

4. The Appellant submitted that he was not satisfied with the reply of the CPIO because, according to him, if the Administrative Judge had indeed ordered his complaints to be filed, the CPIO, in an earlier communication, would not have stated that the matter was under consideration. He further clarified that the order of the Administrative Judge to file the complaints had been made on 13 February 2010 whereas the CPIO had informed him later in that month that the matter was still under consideration and this clearly showed that the CPIO had not told the truth in the matter. In response, the Respondent submitted that the vigilance branch of the High Court had informed the CPIO on 6 February that the matter was under consideration which the then CPIO had forwarded to the Appellant on 22 February 2010 while in the meanwhile, on 13 February 2010, the Administrative Judge had ordered to file the complaints. This fact was not known to the CPIO on 22 February when he had apprised the Appellant about the matter being under consideration. Therefore, the Respondent contended there was no discrepancy in both the responses of the CPIO.

5. Be that as it may, the relevant record would show the exact date on which the Administrative Judge had ordered to file the complaints or had given any other direction. Therefore, we now direct the CPIO to write to the Appellant within 10 working days of receiving this order and to provide him with the attested copies of all the relevant records showing the action taken at the High Court level on his complaints including the order passed by the Administrative Judge.

6. The appeal is disposed off accordingly.
7. Copies of this order be given free of cost to the parties.

(Satyananda Mishra)
Chief 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 Bhalla)
Deputy Registrar