

Telangana State Information Commission

(Under Right to Information Act, 2005)
D.No.5-4-399, Samachara Hakku Bhavan (Old ACB Building),
Mojam-jahi-Market, Hyderabad – 500001.
Phone: 24740155 Fax: 24740592

Appeal No: 4380/SIC-SK/2022

Date: - 17-08-2022

Appellant : Sri K R Kaushal Karan, Hyderabad.
Respondents : Public Information Officer
(U/RTI Act, 2005)
O/o the District R&B Officer,
Ranga Reddy District, Goshamahal,
Hyderabad.

First Appellate Authority
(U/RTI Act, 2005)
O/o the District R&B Officer,
Ranga Reddy District, Goshamahal,
Hyderabad.

Order

Sri K R Kaushal Karan, Hyderabad has filed 2nd appeal dated: 04-04-2022 which was received by this Commission on 04-04-2022 for not getting the information sought by him from the PIO / O/o the District R&B Officer, Ranga Reddy District, Goshamahal, Hyderabad and 1st Appellate Authority / O/o the District R&B Officer, Ranga Reddy District, Goshamahal, Hyderabad.

The brief facts of the case as per the appeal and other records received along with it are that the appellant herein filed an application dated: 06-12-2021 before the PIO requesting to furnish the information under Sec. 6(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, on the following points mentioned in his application:

1. A list of all the offices / officers / officials / Individuals etc to whom a copy of Lr No. RD/DB/D3/2013-2014/1623 Dt. 31-10-2013 was issued/submitted.
2. The certified copies of acknowledgements / receipts obtained from each of the offices / officers / officials / individuals etc in token of having delivered the Lr No. RD/DB/D3/2013-2014/1623 dated 31-10-2013.
3. Was the balance work mentioned in subject part of the Lr No. RD/DB/D3/2013-2014/1623 Dt. 31-10-2013 got executed through any other agency ?
4. Please furnish a copy of work order issued for the balance work mentioned in subject part of the Lr No. RD/DB/ D3/2013-2014/1623 Dt. 31-10-2013.
5. Was any penalty or forfeiture assessed and proposed in the Lr No. RD/DB/ D3/2013-2014/1623 dated 31-10-2013 for the higher authority to exercise the option of waiver or modification of the same ?
6. A copy of the letter addressed to the Indian Bank Uppal Branch in which encashment of Bank Guarantee towards EMD for the work of "Periodical maintenance to Hyderabad-Kareemnagar-Ramagundam road from Km 9/6 to 13/6 (in appropriate reaches) in Ranga Reddy District" was sought.
7. A copy of the report submitted by EE (R&B) Roads Division in response to Memo No. 9112/TS/T2/Periodical Maintenance/2012/1619 Dt. 06-08-2013 issued by SE(R&B), Rural Circle showing outward number of your office and acknowledgement of receipt of the same in O/o the SE(R&B), Rural Circle.

Stating that the appellant did not receive the information from the PIO, the appellant filed 1st appeal dated: 10-01-2022 before the 1st Appellate Authority requesting him to furnish the information sought by him u/s 19(1) of the RTI Act.

Stating that the appellant did not get the information from the PIO / 1st Appellate Authority even after 30 days of filing his 1st appeal, he preferred this 2nd appeal before this Commission requesting to take action against the PIO and 1st Appellate Authority for not furnishing information sought by him and also to arrange to furnish the information sought by him u/s 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.

In view of the above, the 2nd appeal was taken on file and Notices issued to both the parties for hearing on 17-08-2022 at 10.30 A.M.

The case is called on 17-08-2022. The appellant is absent. The PIO / Sri A. Raman Kumar, Deputy Executive Engineer, O/o the Executive Engineer, R&B Department, Ranga Reddy District, Goshamahal, Hyderabad is present and filed his affidavit stating that the information was furnished to the appellant vide letter No: EE(R&B)/RRD/DB/HD/ D3/2020-21/ dated: 29-04-2021 and filed copies of the same before the Commission.

Heard the PIO and perused the material papers available on record. The PIO submitted that a similar case was heard through Appeal No: 9271/SIC-SK/2021 dated: 31-03-2022 and the same was closed since the information was furnished.

The Commission is of the view that PIO has furnished the information to the appellant.

In view of the above, the appeal is closed.

SYED KHALEELULLAH
STATE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER

Authenticated by:

Section Officer
Copy to: SO / SF / OC