

Details of Appeal/Decision of First Appellate Authority for the period April 2021 to May 2021 under RTI Act 2005:

Sl. No.	ID No.	Ground of Appeal	Decision of First Appellate Authority/remarks
1	ITPO/RTI/Appeal/04/11/2021  Sh. Prem Paul, New Delhi	<p><b>“Details not provided.”</b></p> <p><i>Under his Appeal, he has stated that we do not require the information asked for any purpose related to the tender. We have a legal case running at the DLC office against Meals N More in a salary dispute. For the same, we require their address to send across a summon from the DLC office.</i></p>	<p><i>FAA, ITPO, after having perused the RTI application, reply furnished by APIO, and query raised in his 1<sup>st</sup> Appeal, observed and ruled that the applicant/appellant may be replied as under:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The Applicant has sought details of Meals N More submitted in tender application. As the tender for AAHAR 2021 is still under process and requested information is part of tender, hence cannot be disclosed unless the process is completed.</i></li> </ul> <p><b><i>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed off.</i></b></p>
2.	ITPO/RTI/Appeal/04/06/2021  Sh. Mahipal Singh, Delhi	<p>The applicant has filed Appeal dated 16.04.2021 with the Department of Commerce after his RTI of 19.03.2021 regarding release of pension benefits under CCS Rules of the GOI.</p>	<p><i>FAA, ITPO after having pursued the RTI Applications, reply furnished by APIO/PIO and query raised in your appeal with DOC and ruled that applicant may be replied as under :</i></p> <p><i>☐ Replies to your queries has already been furnished time and again.</i></p> <p><i>☐ It is to inform that you have been repeating RTIs/Appeals of similar natures time and again. In this regard you have also been informed about the decision of CIC { No. CIC/AD/A/2013/001326-SA dated 25.06.2014} wherein it is stated that :</i></p> <p><i>(i) Even a single repetition of RTI Application would demand the valuable time of the PA/FAA and if it also reaches second appeal, that of Commission, which time could have been spent to hear another appeal or answer another application or perform other public duty and.</i></p> <p><i>(ii) Every repetition of RTI Application which was earlier responded will be an obstruction to flow of information and defeats the purpose of the RTI Act. CIC thus, decided that:</i></p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Scope of repeating under RTI Act.</li> <li>• Citizen has no right to repeat.</li> <li>• Repetition shall be ground of Refusal.</li> <li>• Appeals can be rejected.</li> </ul> <p>☐ The query raised by you is strictly not covered under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act. Information as existing in material form can only be provided. It is not appropriate to raise such grievance under RTI, as its core job is to disseminate/provide information.</p> <p>☐ The copies of earlier appeal/orders viz. ITPO and CIC on the same subject are enclosed for ready reference.</p> <p>☐ Kindly note that no further RTI / Appeal on the same subject will be entertained by ITPO.</p> <p>☐ With these remarks, the appeal stands rejected.</p>
3.	ITPO/RTI/Appeal/05/03/2021  Sh. Israr Beg, New Delhi-14	<p>➤ The information / reply provided by CPIO, ITPO is not correct.</p> <p>➤ The CPIO has denied the information to me without following rule and section of RTI Act. The copy of letter No. ITPO/RTI/05/03/2021 dated 17.06.2021 of CPIO received on 19.07.2021 is enclosed for reference.</p> <p>➤ It is therefore, requested that as per Section 2(f) of RTI Act 2005, I may be provided the desired information.</p>	<p>❖ The appellant may be once again informed that property details of Mr. Abdul Wahid, Security Supervisor, ITPO information sought by you, is personal information of third party, disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest, or which would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual, qualifies for protection from disclosure u/s 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. Hence, it cannot be provided. As per provision u/s 11 of the RTI Act, third party's consent has been obtained, who have submitted in writing that their personal information/documents should not be disclosed to anybody.</p> <p>❖ Other information is not available in ITPO</p>

			<p><i>record this is already informed to you vide our letter dated. 17.06.2021</i></p> <p><i>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</i></p>
4.	ITPO/RTI/Appeal/04/06/2021  Sh. Mahipal Singh, Delhi.	<p><i>Mr. Mahipal Singh, ex-SM(Elect), ITPO has been filing RTIs and Appeals with ITPO and various other authorities for availing pension benefits applicable to Central Government Employees as per CCS Rules, which, in fact, not applicable in ITPO.</i></p> <p><i>His Second Appeal filed with CIC has also been disposed off during personal hearing on December 15, 2020 wherein CPIO and officers from Finance and Admin were present.</i></p> <p><i>He has been filing RTIs with various Authorities on similar grounds, one of which was received from Karkardooma Court (December 2020) and other from Department of Commerce (March 2021) which were duly replied.</i></p> <p><i>The applicant has filed Appeal dated 16.04.2021 with the Department of Commerce after his RTI of 19.03.2021 regarding release of pension benefits under CCS Rules of the GOI.</i></p>	<p>FAA, ITPO after having pursued the RTI Applications, reply furnished by APIO/PIO and query raised in your appeal with DOC and ruled that applicant may be replied as under :</p> <p>Replies to your queries has already been furnished time and again.</p> <p>It is to inform that you have been repeating RTIs/Appeals of similar natures time and again. In this regard you have also been informed about the decision of CIC { No. CIC/AD/A/2013/001326-SA dated 25.06.2014} wherein it is stated that :</p> <p>(i) Even a single repetition of RTI Application would demand the valuable time of the PA/FAA and if it also reaches second appeal, that of Commission, which time could have been spent to hear another appeal or answer another application or perform other public duty and</p> <p>(ii) Every repetition of RTI Application which was earlier responded will be an obstruction to flow of information and defeats the purpose of the RTI Act. CIC</p>

			<p>thus, decided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Scope of repeating under RTI Act.</li> <li>• Citizen has no right to repeat.</li> <li>• Repetition shall be ground of Refusal.</li> <li>• Appeals can be rejected.</li> </ul> <p>The query raised by you is strictly not covered under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act. Information as existing in material form can only be provided. It is not appropriate to raise such grievance under RTI, as its core job is to disseminate/provide information.</p> <p>The copies of earlier appeal/orders viz. ITPO and CIC on the same subject are enclosed for ready reference.</p> <p>Kindly note that no further RTI / Appeal on the same subject will be entertained by ITPO.</p> <p><b>With these remarks, the appeal stands rejected.</b></p>
5	ITPO/RTI/Appeal/02/05/2021  Sh. K.P.S. Yadav, Ghaziabad	<p>The appellant was not satisfied with the reply and filed the appeal after lapsing of more than 04 months on July 28, 2021 as against the 30 days time limit prescribed under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act 2005.</p> <p>The appeal has been filed on the pretext that Shri Manish Yadav, has falsely acquired the OBC NCL certificate despite being in creamy layer. In order to dig out corruption and being transparency in governance, OBC Certificate may be provided under RTI.</p>	<p>After having perused the RTI application, reply furnished by PIO, and reasons raised in your 1st Appeal, it is reiterated that information sought by you is a third party information and qualified for protection from disclosure under Section 8(1)0) as already conveyed to you by CPIO/PIO via letter dated 08.03.2021.</p> <p>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</p>



Details of Appeal/Decision of First Appellate Authority for the period June 2021 to November 2021 under RTI Act 2005:

Sl. No.	ID No.	Ground of Appeal	Decision of First Appellate Authority/remarks
1.	ITPO/RTI/Appeal/05/03/2021  Sh. Israr Beg, New Delhi-14	<p>➤ <i>The information / reply provided by CPIO, ITPO is not correct.</i></p> <p>➤ <i>The CPIO has denied the information to me without following rule and section of RTI Act. The copy of letter No. ITPO/RTI/05/03/2021 dated 17.06.2021 of CPIO received on 19.07.2021 is enclosed for reference.</i></p> <p>➤ <i>It is therefore, requested that as per Section 2(f) of RTI Act 2005, I may be provided the desired information.</i></p>	<p>❖ <i>The appellant may be once again informed that property details of Mr. Abdul Wahid, Security Supervisor, ITPO information sought by you, is personal information of third party, disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest, or which would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual, qualifies for protection from disclosure u/s 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. Hence, it cannot be provided. As per provision u/s 11 of the RTI Act, third party's consent has been obtained, who have submitted in writing that their personal information/documents should not be disclosed to anybody.</i></p> <p>❖ <i>Other information is not available in ITPO record this is already informed to you vide our letter dated. 17.06.2021</i></p> <p><i>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</i></p>
2.	ITPO/RTI/Appeal/04/06/2021  Sh. Mahipal Singh, Delhi.	<p><i>Mr. Mahipal Singh, ex-SM(Elect), ITPO has been filing RTIs and Appeals with ITPO and various other authorities for availing pension benefits applicable to Central Government Employees as per CCS Rules, which, in fact, not applicable in ITPO.</i></p> <p><i>His Second Appeal filed with CIC has also been disposed off</i></p>	<p><i>FAA, ITPO after having pursued the RTI Applications, reply furnished by APIO/PIO and query raised in your appeal with DOC and ruled that applicant may be replied as under :</i></p> <p><i>Replies to your queries has already been</i></p>

	<p>during personal hearing on December 15, 2020 wherein CPIO and officers from Finance and Admin were present.</p> <p>He has been filing RTIs with various Authorities on similar grounds, one of which was received from Karkardooma Court (December 2020) and other from Department of Commerce (March 2021) which were duly replied.</p> <p>The applicant has filed Appeal dated 16.04.2021 with the Department of Commerce after his RTI of 19.03.2021 regarding release of pension benefits under CCS Rules of the GOI.</p>	<p>furnished time and again.</p> <p>It is to inform that you have been repeating RTIs/Appeals of similar natures time and again. In this regard you have also been informed about the decision of CIC { No. CIC/AD/A/2013/001326-SA dated 25.06.2014} wherein it is stated that :</p> <p>(i) Even a single repetition of RTI Application would demand the valuable time of the PA/FAA and if it also reaches second appeal, that of Commission, which time could have been spent to hear another appeal or answer another application or perform other public duty and</p> <p>(ii) Every repetition of RTI Application which was earlier responded will be an obstruction to flow of information and defeats the purpose of the RTI Act. CIC thus, decided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No Scope of repeating under RTI Act.</li><li>• Citizen has no right to repeat.</li><li>• Repetition shall be ground of Refusal.</li><li>• Appeals can be rejected.</li></ul> <p>The query raised by you is strictly not covered under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act. Information as existing in material form can only be provided. It is not appropriate to raise such grievance under RTI, as its core job is to disseminate/provide information.</p> <p>The copies of earlier appeal/orders viz. ITPO and CIC on the same subject are enclosed for ready reference.</p> <p>Kindly note that no further RTI / Appeal on the same</p>
--	--	---

			<p><i>subject will be entertained by ITPO.</i></p> <p><i>With these remarks, the appeal stands rejected.</i></p>
3	ITPO/RTI/Appeal/02/05/2021  Sh. K.P.S. Yadav, Ghaziabad	<p>The appellant was not satisfied with the reply and filed the appeal after lapsing of more than 04 months on July 28, 2021 as against the 30 days time limit prescribed under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act 2005.</p> <p>The appeal has been filed on the pretext that Shri Manish Yadav, has falsely acquired the OBC NCL certificate despite being in creamy layer. In order to dig out corruption and being transparency in governance, OBC Certificate may be provided under RTI.</p>	<p>After having perused the RTI application, reply furnished by PIO, and reasons raised in your 1st Appeal, it is reiterated that information sought by you is a third party information and qualified for protection from disclosure under Section 8(1)(D) as already conveyed to you by CPIO/PIO via letter dated 08.03.2021.</p> <p>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</p>
4	ITPO/RTI/Appeal/09/03/2021 Sh. Harinarayan Pathak, Guwahati	<p>➤ <i>The appellant stated that CPIO has forwarded the reply without any DOCUMENTARY PROOFS / RECORDS, and on perusal, found unsatisfactory, leading to this FIRST APPEAL PETITION u/s. 19(1) of RTI Act, 2005, on following facts:</i></p> <p>➤ <i>That CPIO, ITPO, though her reply had admitted that "The ITPO has given the work to CPWD on deposit basis. CPWD had executed the work starting from taking all statutory approval and handing over after completion".</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">-2-</p> <p>➤ <i>Through the aforesaid decision/reply, CPIO had admitted that the ITPO. have in possession of all relevant Documentary Proofs/records, except , N.O.C. issued from G.M.D.A. or G.M.C.. in respect of Constructions of M.D. T.C., a Unit of A.T.P.O, Guwahati from beginning till handover from CPWD.</i></p> <p>➤ <i>But, unfortunately, CPIO, ITPO, New Delhi, inadvertently, could not furnishing such</i></p>	<p><i>The RTI application &amp; appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">❖ <i>"There is no record available with us, since the work was done by CPWD, we have requested CPWD to provide information directly to the applicant".</i></p> <p><i>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</i></p>



		<p><i>Documentary Proofs/Records, held by ITPO, New Delhi.</i></p> <p>➤ <i>THAT Letter under reference against point no. 2 of my application the SPIO, ATPO in his reply stated that the Dept. of Commerce, GOI in association with ITPO, New Delhi developed the project through CPWD. As such, all the relevant documentary proofs/records in respect of construction of MDTC are held by ITPO, New Delhi except NOC from GMDA/GMC.</i></p>	
5	ITPO/RTI/Appeal/09/10/2021 Sh. Rohit Sonkar, Delhi	<p><i>The appellant not satisfied with the reply of point no. 2, filed First Appeal dated 16.11.2021 before the First Appellate Authority, ITPO stating that:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. The information is being denied on the pretext that it deals with ongoing disciplinary proceedings (nature of investigation, Sec 8(1)(h) of RTI Act 2005) and it hampers the discretion of the Inquiry Officer to decide as to what documents the officer proceeded against will have access to.</i></li> <li><i>2. Secondly, CIC ruling whose reference is quoted unequivocally.</i></li> </ol>	<p><i>The RTI application &amp; appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully. It was further informed by the concerned Division that a request / complaint dated August 02, 2021 was received from applicant for change of IO, on allegation of biasness. The matter was processed on the file of disciplinary proceedings itself giving brief of the case and status of proceedings, hence the noting portion for appointment of Shri B.K. Dubey as IO was denied as covered under u/s 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act.</i></p> <p><i>Being satisfied with the facts brought to the notice, the information sought vide point no.2 cannot be disclosed being covered u/s 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act 2005.</i></p> <p><i>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed off.</i></p>

Details of Appeal/Decision of First Appellate Authority for the period December 2021 to March 2022 under RTI Act 2005:

Sl. No.	ID No.	Ground of Appeal	Decision of First Appellate Authority/remarks
1.	ITPO/RTI/A/12/03&10/2021  Shri. Rohit Sonkar, Delhi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Appeal under section 19(1) of the RTI Act, against the decision taken by of the Public Information Officer in rejecting all the information sought by me in my applications dated Nil and dated 15.12.2021, on the ground that the information sought in these applications were not covered under the ambit of information as defined under section 2(f) of the RTI Act, 2005..</li> <li>➤ My submission is that the queries raised by me in the RTI Application and DRTI Application were not in the nature of seeking any advice, clarification or opinion, they were only with regard to the information held by the Public Authority. Thus the information sought by the undersigned fell within the definition of the section 2(f) of the RTI Act, 2005</li> <li>➤ It is pertinent to mention here that information that a public body has access to is deemed information under Section 2(f) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 as per para 8 of the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the matter of Poorna Prajna High School V/s. Central Information Commission.</li> <li>➤ In order to further elaborate my point I would like to draw your attention to the observations made by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in WP(C) No. 7265 of 2007 (Date of Decision 25th September, 2009) wherein the Court has clarified the definition of "information" under section 2(f) of the RTI Act, 2005.</li> <li>➤ Furthermore, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Khanapuram Gandaiah Vs. Administrative Officer &amp; Ors. Decided on 04.01.2009, held that:</li> </ul> <p><i>"Under the RTI Act "information" is defined under Section 2(f) which provided: "information" means any material in any form, including records, documents, memos, e-mails, opinions, advices, press releases, circulars, orders, logbooks, contracts, report, papers, samples, models, data material held in any electronic form and information relating to any private body which can be accessed by a public authority under any other law for the time being in force."</i></p> <p><i>This definition shows that an applicant under section 6 of the RTI Act can get any information which is already in existence and accessible to the public authority under law. Of course, under the RTI Act an applicant is entitled to get copy of the opinions, advices, circulars, orders, etc., but he cannot ask for any information as to why such opinions, advices, circulars, orders, etc. have been passed.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The information sought by the applicant is of nature of query.</li> <li>❖ Kind attention is invited at Section 2(f) of RTI Act defining "information" as under:-  <i>"information" means any material in any form, including records, documents, memos, e-mails, opinions, advices, press releases, circulars, orders, logbooks, contracts, reports, papers, samples, models, data material held in any electronic form and information relating to any private body which can be accessed by a public authority under any other law for the time being in force;"</i></li> <li>❖ The applicant is well aware of the facts of his arrest and subsequent suspension.</li> <li>❖ Copy of Order No. (R-77)/ITPO/E-III/2015 dated 25.02.2020 already served to the applicant, i.e., Shri Rohit Sonkar may be referred.</li> </ul>
2.	ITPO/RTI/A/01/06/2022  Sh. R.K. Suneja, N.D	<p><i>I raised 3 questions in my RTI application, but I have received only the first question's answer, and this answer is also not proper.</i></p> <p><i>My questions were – 1. Is there any rule regarding the refund of payment made for booking stalls in the fairs organized</i></p>	<p><i>Q.1. As per practice refunds are processed only in the name of the company who has participated in an event or applied participation in any event, as the case may be.</i></p> <p><i>Q.2 During last 3 years</i></p>

		<p><i>by ITPO, that the payment will “compulsorily” be credited to the bank account in the same name as the Company name given in the stall booking application. 2. Whether all refunds in the last 3 years have been compulsorily made in the bank account in the name of the company applying for the stall booking.? 3. If any payment has been made to a bank account other than the name of the company, please provide the details for the same.</i></p> <p><i>In the reply, I received only this answer – “Generally” refunds are processed only in the name of the Company who has participated in an event or applied participation in any event, as the case may be.</i></p> <p><i>They answer me what they do “Generally”, but do not reply that if it is “compulsorily” mandatory or not.</i></p> <p><i>Q2–Not answered.</i></p> <p><i>Q3–Notanswered.</i></p> <p><i>So, this is requested you that please give me answers to all 3 questions, and the answers should be specific, not generally.</i></p>	<p><i>various exhibitions have been organized by ITPO in New Delhi as well as in other regions of the country/world wherein a large number of companies have participated. The information sought by applicant is voluminous in nature. Applicant may be requested to inform the name and period of the exhibition specifically so that information could be retrieved and provided.</i></p> <p><i>Q.3 Reply same as per S.No. 2 above.</i></p>
3.	<p>ITPO/RTI/A/12/04,05,08&amp;09/2021</p> <p>(04 Appeal Replay) Sh. Rohit Sonkar, ND</p>	<p>The Appellant being not contented with the information provided by PIO, filed 1st Appeal before the FAA, ITPO stating that PIO denied the information on baseless and flimsy grounds in a mechanical way without going in detail with what information had been sought for under the ambit of RTI act.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• The reply provided under RTIs is reiterated.</i></li> <li><i>• Kind attention is invited to Section 2(f) of RTI Act defining “information” as “Information” means any material in any form, including records, documents, memos, e-mails, opinions, advices, press releases, circulars, orders, logbooks, contracts, reports, papers, samples, models, data material held in any electronic form and information relating to any private body which can be accessed by a public authority under any other law for the time being in force;”</i></li> <li><i>• The Departmental Inquiry under extant conduct Rules of ITPO is underway against Shri Rohit Sonkar, M (u/s), i.e., the applicant on account of his misconduct related to non compliance of the guidelines and procedure in allotment of space through on-line booking system for AAHAR 2020.</i></li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Section 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act exempts an information which would impede the process of investigation or apprehension or prosecution of offenders. Further, In respect of vigilance related inquiries and disciplinary matters, 'investigation' includes all enquiries, verification of records, and assessments and is completed only after the competent authority makes decision on presence or absence of guilt on receipt of the Inquiry report from the Inquiry officer. Considering the ongoing departmental inquiry for misconduct related to non compliance of guidelines of online booking module in Aahar'20 , the information is denied under Section 8(1) h of RTI Act 2005. Accordingly, disclosure of any document related to Aahar'20 and specifically to online space booking has to be taken up in the inquiry and as provided under the rules.</i></li><li>• <i>Further, you are informed that you have been filing multiple RTIs of similar nature and that shall be ground of refusal. As decided by CIC vide its decision No. CIC/AD/A/2013/001326-SA dated 25.06.2014 that there is no scope of repeating under RTI Act and repetitions of RTI shall be ground of refusal and Appeals can be rejected. Further, even a single repetition of RTI application would demand the valuable time of the Public Authority and FAA and the Commission. Every repetition of RTI Application will be an obstruction to flow of information and defeats the purpose of RTI Act.</i></li></ul>
4	ITPO/RTI/04/06/2021  Sh. Mahipal Singh, Delhi	This is with reference to your appeal dated 24.01.2022 filed with Department of Commerce against your RTI Application filed with DPE on 27.12.2021 and in-turn received in ITPO as transfer through DoC on	2. It may be mentioned that you have been filing similar RTIs with one or the other Authority time and again. And it has been time and again mentioned that the

		<p>08.02.2022. The said RTI Application was received as transfer in ITPO 18.01.2022 was duly replied vide our letter No. ITPO/RTI/01/10/2022 dated February 01, 2022.</p>	<p>query raised by you is strictly not covered under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act. Information as existing in material form can only be provided. It is not appropriate to raise such grievance under RTI, as its core job is to disseminate/provide information.</p> <p>3. You have been informed, time and again, that w.r.t your grievance, related to Pensions, Arrears etc., to contact / meet the Grievance Officer of ITPO and sort out the issues.</p> <p>4. It may also be mentioned that even a single repetition of RTI / Appeal would demand valuable time of the Public Authority/FAA and every repetition which was earlier responded will be an obstruction to flow of information and defeats the purpose of RTI Act. Repetition shall be ground of refusal and Appeals can be rejected.</p>
5	<p>ITPO/RTI/A/01/01,02,04&amp;05 /2022</p> <p>(04 Appeal Reply)</p> <p>Sh. Akshay, New Delhi</p>	<p>The Appellant being not contented with the information provided by PIO, filed 1st Appeal(s) before the FAA, ITPO stating that PIO denied the information on baseless and flimsy grounds in a mechanical way without going in detail with what information had been sought for under the ambit of RTI act.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>The reply provided under RTI is reiterated.</i></li><li>• <i>The information sought seems to be in nature of query and not specifically covered under the ambit of Information under the RTI Act. Kind attention is invited at Section 2(f) of RTI Act defining "information" as "Information" means any material in any form, including records, documents, memos, e-mails, opinions, advices, press releases, circulars, orders, logbooks, contracts, reports, papers, samples, models, data material held in any electronic form and information relating to any private body which can be accessed by a public authority under any other law for the time being in force;"</i></li><li>• <i>The Departmental Inquiry under extant conduct Rules of ITPO is underway against Shri Rohit</i></li></ul>

			<p><i>Sonkar, M (u/s), i.e., the applicant on account of his misconduct related to non compliance of the guidelines and procedure in allotment of space through on-line booking system for AAHAR 2020 etc.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>• Section 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act exempts an information which would impede the process of investigation or apprehension or prosecution of offenders. Further, In respect of vigilance related inquiries and disciplinary matters, 'investigation' includes all enquiries, verification of records, and assessments and is completed only after the competent authority makes decision on presence or absence of guilt on receipt of the Inquiry report from the Inquiry officer. Considering the ongoing departmental inquiry for misconduct related to non compliance of guidelines of online booking module in Aahar'20, the information is denied under Section 8(1) h of RTI Act 2005.</i></li><li><i>• You have sought information related to charge-sheet of Shri Rohit Sonkar, inquiry of which is going on. With regard to third party information, it may be noted that information shall not be disclosed unless the competent authority is satisfied that larger public interest warrants the disclosure of such information. As the information pertains to 3<sup>rd</sup> Party and does not serve larger public interest, it has been denied.</i></li></ul> <p><i>Further, it has been noted that you have been filing multiple RTIs of similar nature and that shall be ground of refusal. As</i></p>
--	--	--	--

			<p><i>decided by CIC vide its decision No. CIC/AD/A/2013/001326-SA dated 25.06.2014 that there is no scope of repeating under RTI Act and repetitions of RTI shall be ground of refusal and rejection of appeals. Even a single repetition of RTI application demands the valuable time of the Public Authority and FAA and the Commission and creates obstruction in flow of information and therefore, defeats the purpose of RTI Act.</i></p>
6.	ITPO/RTI/A/01/03/2022  Sh. Akshay, New Delhi	The Appellant being not contented with the information provided by PIO, filed 1st Appeal before the FAA, ITPO stating that PIO denied the information on baseless and flimsy grounds in a mechanical way without going in detail with what information had been sought for under the ambit of RTI act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reply provided under RTI is reiterated.</li> <li>• The information sought seems to be in nature of query and not specifically covered under the ambit of Information under the RTI Act. Kind attention is invited at Section 2(f) of RTI Act defining "information" as under:-</li> </ul> <p>"information" means any material in any form, including records, documents, memos, e-mails, opinions, advices, press releases, circulars, orders, logbooks, contracts, reports, papers, samples, models, data material held in any electronic form and information relating to any private body which can be accessed by a public authority under any other law for the time being in force;"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copy of Order dated 25.02.2020 already served to Shri Akshay, (Applicant) may be referred by him.</li> </ul>
7.	ITPO/RTI/A/01/07/2022  Sh. Akshay, New Delhi	The Appellant being not contented with the information provided by PIO, filed 1st Appeal(s) before the FAA, ITPO stating that PIO denied the information on baseless and flimsy grounds in a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reply provided under RTI is reiterated.</li> </ul> <p>The composition of the Review Committees (1st, 2<sup>nd</sup> &amp; 3<sup>rd</sup>) were already provided to the</p>

		<p>mechanical way without going in detail with what information had been sought for under the ambit of RTI act.</p>	<p>applicant. As regards names of the Committee Members, the same may not be considered under Section 8(1)(g) of the RTI Act. Section 8(1)(g) of the RTI Act exempts the disclosure of “information”, the disclosure of which would endanger the life or physical, safety of any person or identify the source of information or assistance given in confidence for law enforcement or security purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Departmental Inquiry under extant conduct Rules of ITPO is underway against Shri Akshay, DM (u/s), i.e., the applicant on account of his misconduct related to non compliance of the guidelines and procedure in allotment of space through on-line booking system for AAHAR 2020 etc.</li> <li>• Section 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act <b>exempts an information which would impede the process of investigation or apprehension or prosecution of offenders.</b> Further, In respect of vigilance related inquiries and disciplinary matters, 'investigation' includes all enquiries, verification of records, and assessments and is completed only after the competent authority makes decision on presence or absence of guilt on receipt of the Inquiry report from the Inquiry officer. Considering the ongoing departmental inquiry for misconduct related to non compliance of guidelines of online booking module in Aahar'20, the information is denied under Section 8(1) h of RTI Act 2005.</li> <li>• It has been noted that you have been filing multiple RTIs of similar nature and that shall be ground of refusal. As decided by CIC vide its decision No. CIC/AD/A/2013/001326-SA dated 25.06.2014 that there is no scope of repeating under RTI Act and repetitions of RTI shall be ground of refusal and rejection of appeals. Even a single repetition of RTI application demands the valuable time of the Public Authority and FAA and the Commission and creates obstruction in flow of information and therefore, defeats the purpose of RTI Act.</li> </ul>
8	<p>ITPO/RTI/A/01/08/2022</p> <p>Sh. Akshay, New Delhi</p>	<p>The Appellant being not contented with the information provided by PIO, filed 1st Appeal(s) before the FAA, ITPO stating that PIO denied the information on baseless and flimsy grounds in a mechanical way without going in detail with what information had been sought for under the ambit of RTI act.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reply provided under RTI is reiterated.</li> </ul> <p>The composition of the Review Committees were already provided to the applicant. As regards names of the Committee Members, the same may not be considered under Section 8(1)(g) of the RTI Act. Section 8(1)(g) of the RTI Act exempts the disclosure of “information”,</p>



			<p>the disclosure of which would endanger the life or physical, safety of any person or identify the source of information or assistance given in confidence for law enforcement or security purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Departmental Inquiry under extant conduct Rules of ITPO is underway against Shri Akshay, DM (u/s), i.e., the applicant on account of his misconduct related to non compliance of the guidelines and procedure in allotment of space through on-line booking system for AAHAR 2020 etc.</li> <li>• Section 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act <b>exempts an information which would impede the process of investigation or apprehension or prosecution of offenders.</b> Further, In respect of vigilance related inquiries and disciplinary matters, 'investigation' includes all enquiries, verification of records, and assessments and is completed only after the competent authority makes decision on presence or absence of guilt on receipt of the Inquiry report from the Inquiry officer. Considering the ongoing departmental inquiry for misconduct related to non compliance of guidelines of online booking module in Aahar'20, the information is denied under Section 8(1) h of RTI Act 2005.</li> <li>• It has been noted that you have been filing multiple RTIs of similar nature and that shall be ground of refusal. As decided by CIC vide its decision No. CIC/AD/A/2013/001326-SA dated 25.06.2014 that there is no scope of repeating under RTI Act and repetitions of RTI shall be ground of refusal and rejection of appeals. Even a single repetition of RTI application demands the valuable time of the Public Authority and FAA and the Commission and creates obstruction in flow of information and therefore, defeats the purpose of RTI Act.</li> </ul>
9	ITPO/RTI/A/02/11/2022  Sh. Ashok Kumar, SM, ITPO	The Appellant being not contented with the information provided by PIO, filed 1st Appeal(s) before the FAA, ITPO stating that PIO deliberately concealed the vital information and requisite documents and have not provided the required information and documents and deliberately denied the requisite information or knowingly provided the incomplete, incorrect or misleading information.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The allegation of the applicant against the Public Authority is baseless. Information as existing and available and furnished by the concerned unit/division was provided to the applicant. Public Authorities cannot invent information as per the whims of the applicant.</li> <li>• The reply provided in</li> </ul>

			<p>respect of the RTI has been reiterated. The orders dated 08.09.2021 and 13.09.2021 were issued at HoD level and not processed in the relevant file maintained in the Section. An inspection of the file was also carried out by the applicant on 25.03.2022.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The note/document regarding work allocation of GM(SRSahoo) was submitted to CMD/ED by GM(SRSahoo). The information is submitted in fiduciary relationship and disclosure of it does not serve any public interest and hence denied.</li><li>• With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of. A copy of this decision be sent to the appellant and CPIO, ITPO.</li></ul>
--	--	--	---

Details of Appeal/Decision of First Appellate Authority for the period April 2022 to July 2022 under RTI Act 2005:

Sl. No.	ID No.	Ground of Appeal	Decision of First Appellate Authority/remarks
1.	ITPO/RTI/01/19/2022  Ashok Kumar, New Delhi	The Appellant being not contented with the information provided by CPIO, filed Ist Appeal(s) before the FAA, ITPO stating that PIO deliberately concealed the vital information and requisite documents and have not provided the required information and documents and deliberately denied the requisite information or knowingly provided the incomplete, incorrect misleading information.	<p>The RTI application &amp; appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The applicant has already inspected the file containing the said office order</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The approval of the concerned Govt. Agency for holding B2C event in Covid 19 scenario was received on 15.09.2021. Accordingly, the terms and conditions of IITF 2021 were put up for approval of the Competent Authority thereafter.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A decision of CIC in the case of Dr. K.C. Vijayakumaran Nair Vs Department of Post, may please be referred by the applicant wherein CIC is of the view that if the information seeker is an employee of the respondent, he himself is a part of the information provider. Under the RTI, the employees are not expected to question the decisions of the superior officers in the garb of seeking information. Such employees have access to internal mechanisms for redressal of their grievances. They ought to exercise restraints in misusing the Act, lest they should dilute the mandate of RTI Act to empower the common man.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Another decision of CIC may be referred in the case of Smt. Uma Kanti &amp; Shri Ramesh Chandra Vs. Navodaya Vidhyalaya wherein CIC directs the Respondents not to consider the RTI-applications filed by this Appellant and his wife since the RTI cannot be turned into a tool for vendetta of an employee against his Organisation for some grievance that one harbours against it.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of. A copy of this decision be sent to the appellant and CPIO, ITPO.</p>

2	ITPO/RTI/01/17/2022  Ashok Kumar, New Delhi	The Appellant being not contented with the information provided by CPIO, filed Ist Appeal(s) before the FAA, ITPO stating that PIO deliberately concealed the vital information and requisite documents and have not provided the required information and documents and deliberately denied the requisite information or knowingly provided the incomplete, incorrect or misleading information.	<p>The RTI application &amp; appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There is no role of the E-1 Section of the Administration Division in issuing the order dated 08.09.2021 as cited by the applicant. The relevant documents have already been provided to the applicant</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Copy of the order dated 13 11.2020 wherein Internal Grievance Redressal Committee at work place for person belonging to SC caste was constituted in accordance to guidelines issue by NCSC's letter No 39/Misc-21GR Committee/2020/SSW-I Dated 29 07.2020 is already provided to the applicant The findings of the Committees were already provided to the applicant vide letter dated 31.01.2022</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> As regards contention of applicant regarding nomination of SM(VV) and DGM(BL), it may be noted that query in original RTI is limited to Office Order and composition related to "Internal Grievance Redressal Committee in accordance with NCSC letter dated 29 07 2020, information on which was already provided to applicant.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> As regards the report, it is informed that the matter is pending with National Commission for Scheduled Castes and outcome/report cannot be disclosed under Section 8(h) of the RTI Act 2005 which states that information which would impede the process of investigation or apprehension or prosecution of offenders is exempted from disclosure</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of. A copy of this decision be sent to the appellant and CPIO, ITPO.</p> <p>The appellant may prefer an appeal u/s 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005 before the Central Information Commission, CIC Bhawan, Baba Gangnath Marg, Munirka, New Delhi 110067 against this order within 90 days, if so desires.</p>
3.	ITPO/RTI/04/14/2022	The applicant had filed RTI application vide Registration No.	Since the information pertains to your office, the

	Jayanta Kumar Das, Orisa	<p>ITPOR/R/E/22/00030 dated. 22/04/2022 received online seeking information does not pertain to ITPO and instead it pertains to DPIIT, Ministry of Commerce &amp; Industries, New Delhi. The RTI had been transferred to DPIIT dated. 26/04/2022.</p> <p>We have received 1<sup>st</sup> Appeal Application vide Registration No. ITPOR/A/E/22/00009 dated 23<sup>rd</sup> May, 2022 received on ITPO Portal on 24.05.2022 from Shri Jayanta Kumar Das, Styra Nagar, Sida Mahabir Patana, Puri-752002 (Odisha). A copy of the 1<sup>st</sup> Appeal Application received is attached for your reference.</p>	said 1 <sup>st</sup> Appeal application is being transferred to Appellate Authority, Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade, New Delhi, of the RTI Act, 2005 for furnishing the requisite information, as per RTI Act, 2005, directly to the applicant.
4.	ITPO/RTI/04/06/2022  Ashok Kumar, New Delhi	<p>The Appellant being not contented with the information provided by CPIO, filed 1<sup>st</sup> Appeal(s) before the FAA, ITPO stating that PIO deliberately concealed the vital information and requisite documents and have not provided the required information and documents and deliberately denied the requisite information or knowingly provided the incomplete, incorrect or misleading information.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated.</li> <li>• The applicant had already inspected the relevant file No.2-ITPO(1)/E-1/2019 on 11.05.2022 in the room of PIO where AM(RN) and SA (Rakesh Kumar Dagar) were present.</li> <li>• It is again reiterated that no such feedback/reports/comments are available in Admin. regarding transfer of applicant.</li> <li>• As already informed to the applicant that the matter is pending with National Commission for Scheduled Castes. Section 8(h) of the RTI Act 2005 states that information which would impede the process of investigation or apprehension or prosecution of offenders is exempted from disclosure.</li> <li>• With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of. A copy of this decision be sent to the appellant and CPIO, ITPO.</li> </ul>

5.	<p>ITPO/RTI/04/07/2022</p> <p>Ashok Kumar, New Delhi</p>	<p>The Appellant being not contented with the information provided by CPIO, filed 1st Appeal(s) before the FAA, ITPO stating that PIO deliberately concealed the vital information and requisite documents and have not provided the required information and documents and deliberately denied the requisite information or knowingly provided the incomplete, incorrect or misleading information.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated.</li> <li>• An interim reply was provided to the applicant vide PIO reply dated 13.05.2022 since the information sought by the applicant was to be provided by various Divisions. Moreover, all were busy in pre-fair activities in organising AAHAR 2022 which was to be opened on April 26, 2022.</li> <li>• With regard to unanswered/remaining queries, the reply is provided as above based on the inputs provided by the concerned Divisions.</li> <li>• The applicant has been filing repeated RTIs/Appeals which prima facie appears to be not in public interest. Further, compilation of information on such RTIs/Appeals causes unwarranted diversion of available human resources.</li> <li>• It is also mentioned that the applicant (Shri Ashok Kumar) was earlier posted in FS-II Division and privy to the information and internal discussions. The information sought by the applicant is not in public interest and prima facie appears to be vindictive.</li> <li>• As already informed to the applicant, vide reply to his Appeal dated 13.05.2022/RTI dated 28.01.2022, CIC decisions in the case of Dr. K.C. Vijayakumaran Nair</li> </ul>
----	--	--	---

			<p>Vs Department of Post, may please be referred wherein it is stated that the employees are not expected to question the decisions of the superior officers in the garb of seeking information. Such employees have access to internal mechanisms for redressal of their grievances. They ought to exercise restraints in misusing the Act, lest they should dilute the mandate of RTI Act to empower the common man along with CIC decision in the case of Smt. Uma Kanti &amp; Shri Ramesh Chandra Vs. Navodaya Vidhyalaya wherein CIC directs the Respondents not to consider the RTI-applications filed by this Appellant and his wife since the RTI cannot be turned into a tool for vendetta of an employee against his Organisation for some grievance that one harbours against it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of. A copy of this decision be sent to the appellant and CPIO, ITPO.</li> </ul>
6.	ITPO/RTI/04/08-11/2022  Kuldeep, New Dehi	<p>Four Nos. of 1<sup>st</sup> Appeal Applications are received in ITPO from Shri Kuldeep of Delhi seeking information pertaining to various points for Re-development of ITPO Complex into Integrated Exhibition-Cum-Convention Centre (<b>IECC</b>) at Pragati Maidan, New Delhi on Design, Engineering, Procurement and Construction (EPC) basis including operation &amp; Maintenance" by India Trade Promotion Organisation (ITPO).</p>	<p>NBCC, being Project Management Consultant (PMC), all the RTIs received from the appellant were transferred to NBCC vide PIO, ITPO letter No. ITPO/RTI/04/08,09,10&amp;11/2022 dated. 22/04/2022 as per provision u/s 6(3) of the RTI Act, 2005 for providing the requisite information directly to the applicant</p> <p>The applicant has informed that no reply is received within thirty days of the receipt of the</p>







Details of Appeal/Decision of First Appellate Authority for the period August 2022 to March 2023 under RTI Act 2005:

Sl. No.	ID No.	Ground of Appeal	Decision of First Appellate Authority/remarks
1.	ITPO/RTI/07/12/2022 Sh. Sandeep Singh	<p><i>The Applicant/Appellant, being not satisfied with the information provided by CPIO/PIO, ITPO, filed 1st Appeal dated 03.09.2022 before the First Appellate Authority, ITPO stating that the applicant/appellant, being unsatisfied with the information furnished to him has submitted first Appeal dated 03.09.2022 before the FAA stating:-</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>Details not provided.</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Provided Incomplete, Misleading or False Information.</i></li> </ul>	<p>❖ <i>Information already provided to the applicant in reply to his RTI Application dated. 28.07.2022 the matter regarding pay arrears etc. to the canteen employees is under submission and yet to be decided by the Competent Authority.</i></p> <p>❖ <i>Being a administrative matter and decision on it to be taken by the management. As an when the decision on it is taken, the concerned will be apprised accordingly.</i></p> <p><i>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</i></p>
2.	ITPO/RTI/08/11/2022 Sh. Vivek Sharma Bhiwadi, Rajasthan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>Details not provided.</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Provided Incomplete, Misleading or False Information.</i></li> <li>➤ <i>The learned CPIO deprived me from my right of access to information as no information is provided out of 11. On perusal, this is also self evident that certified copies of relevant documents, related to even single information / basis on which CPIO gave rulings, has not been provided to me. It is pertinent to mention here that similar RTI Online Applications was registered with certain Ministries, PSUs, PSBs, RBI, DFS, NITI AAYOG, CAT, UT State Legislative Authority Chandigarh etc &amp; point wise specific information along with certified copies of relevant documents have been made available by each of these Institutions. Sir, In light of above, I once again humbly request to provide me specific point wise information along with certified copies of relevant documents, especially in due consideration of commitment of</i></li> </ul>	<p>❖ <i>Information, as available and existing has been already provided to the applicant in reply to his RTI Application no. ITPOR/R/E/22/00044 dated. 31.08.2022. No further information / documents are available on the points raised by the applicant.</i></p> <p><i>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</i></p>

[illegible]



Details of Appeal/Decision of First Appellate Authority for the period April 2023 under RTI Act 2005:

Sl. No.	ID No.	Ground of Appeal	Decision of First Appellate Authority/remarks
1.	ITPO/RTI/A/04/02/2023  Sh. Ravi Prakash Pareek, Ghaziabad	The information provided in response to my RTI dated. 10.04.2023 for S. No. 1 is not complete. The approval of competent authority on the proposal decision has not been provided	<p>❖ As per RTI, only noting portion of Mongolia Exhibition November, 2022 where decision was taken not to send Sh. Ravi Prakash Pareek to Mongolia. The approval of the competent authority on the proposed decision copy of noting portion (photocopy 02 pages) is enclosed.</p> <p>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</p>

Details of Appeal/Decision of First Appellate Authority for the period May 2023 to June 2023 under RTI Act 2005:

Sl. No.	ID No.	Ground of Appeal	Decision of First Appellate Authority/remarks
1.	ITPO/RTI/A/06/04&05/2023  Sh. Ashish Shankar, Bihar	The Appellant being not contented with the information provided by PIO, filed Ist Appeal(s) before the FAA, ITPO stating that PIO provided incomplete, misleading or false information.	The RTI application & appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by PIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-  · The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated.  · With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of. A copy of this decision be sent to the appellant and CPIO, ITPO.

Details of Appeal/Decision of First Appellate Authority for the period July 2023 to August 2023 under RTI Act 2005:

Sl. No.	ID No.	Ground of Appeal	Decision of First Appellate Authority/remarks
	NIL		

Details of Appeal/Decision of First Appellate Authority for the period September 2023 under RTI Act 2005:

Sl. No.	ID No.	Ground of Appeal	Decision of First Appellate Authority/remarks
	NIL		



Details of Appeal/Decision of First Appellate Authority for the period October & November, 2023 under RTI Act 2005:

Sl. No.	ID No.	Ground of Appeal	Decision of First Appellate Authority/remarks
	NIL		

Details of Appeal/Decision of First Appellate Authority for the period December, 2023 under RTI Act 2005:

Sl. No.	ID No.	Ground of Appeal	Decision of First Appellate Authority/remarks
	NIL		

Details of Appeal/Decision of First Appellate Authority for the period January, 2024 under RTI Act 2005:

Sl. No.	ID No.	Ground of Appeal	Decision of First Appellate Authority/remarks
1.	NIL		

Details of Appeal/Decision of First Appellate Authority for the period February’ 24 to March, 2024 under RTI Act 2005:

Sl. No.	ID No.	Ground of Appeal	Decision of First Appellate Authority/remarks
1.	NIL		

Details of Appeal/Decision of First Appellate Authority for the period April to June , 2024 under RTI Act 2005:

[illegible]

	Tamilnadu	sought in the RTI.	<p>and the following order is passed:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated. Information has been already provided to you vide our letter dated. 20.05.2024.</li> <li>❖ No further information / document are available in ITPO with existing system.</li> </ul> <p><b>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</b></p>
3.	ITPO/RTI/A/04/02/2024  Mr. Balram Jaiswal, Delhi	<p>The Applicant/Appellant, being not satisfied with the information provided by CPIO/PIO, ITPO, filed 1st Appeal dated 21.05.2024 before the First Appellate Authority, ITPO stating that the applicant/appellant, being unsatisfied with the information furnished to him has submitted first Appeal dated 21.05.2024 before the FAA stating:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has ITPO displayed the salaries and wages of all employees (Permanent/Contractual)) on its websites as mandated under RTI act. If yes, kindly confirm the same with detail of the link.</li> <li>2. If the answered to the question 1 is yes under what rule and policy Smt. Amrapali Dixit (PIO) has refused to divulge the salary perked and wages Shri VP Bhatia. Kindly provide me the required copy of rules.</li> <li>3. Kindly provide the rules/ Policies under which ITPO can appoint any individual under any category on nomination basis. Also provide the financial power and duration for which any authority can appoint any individual without call of open interview. Provide me a copy of rules/Policy which authorizes ITPO in denying other capable/ eligible citizen of India from applying to the post of consultant in ITPO. Copy of such rules of exception may kindly be provided.</li> <li>4. Please provide copy of approval of competent authority to appoint advisor on nomination basis.</li> <li>5. List of Vendors engaged in providing Logistical support at ITPO like tentage, luminaries, stage , backdrops, flower decoration etc. in past 03 years and the payment made to them.</li> <li>6. Provide me list of content appointed by ITPO on nomination basis in past ten years and expenditure incurred (CTC) on them each year. If the information</li> </ol>	<p>The RTI application &amp; appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Information, as available and existing has been already provided to the applicant in reply to his RTI Application dated. 20.04.2024 vide PIO, ITPO letter dated. 13.05.2024.</li> <li>❖ It is informed that the PIO, ITPO had replied to the applicant vide letter No. ITPO/RTI/04/02/2024 dated 13.05.2024 that the details of the requisite information inter-alia contains consolidated remuneration (01 page) can be obtained from the RTI Cell, ITPO, however, the applicant did not came forward to collect the docs.(copy attached).</li> <li>❖ Total salary and wages of all employees reflecting in annual accounts in public domain, however, individual data is not available, as ITPO website is currently under re-construction.</li> <li>❖ In the instant first appeal, the applicant has raised additional issues, which are different from the original RTI application, for which the applicant needs to file a fresh RTI. In this connection, kindly refer to the Central Information Commission, is decision No.CIC/AB/A/2016/000004 dated 22.08.2017.</li> <li>❖ According to RTI Act. u/s 19(6) it is mandatory to dispose off of appeal within 30 days, but the appeal is being disposed of after 30 days as the First Appellate Authority was on leave.</li> </ul>

		<i>is voluminous and large in number I may kindly be given the opportunity to inspect the document in person.</i>	<b><i>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</i></b>
	<b><u>JUNE 2024</u></b>		
1	ITPO/RTI/A/05/10/2024  Mr. Siddharth Gupta, N.D	<i>The Appellant being not contented with the information provided by CPIO, filed Ist Appeal before the FAA, ITPO stating that PIO deliberately concealed the vital information and requisite documents and have not provided the required information and documents and deliberately denied the requisite information or knowingly provided the incomplete, incorrect or misleading information.</i>	<p><i>The RTI application &amp; appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ <i>Information has been already provided to the applicant in reply to his RTI Application dated. 31.05.2024 vide CPIO/PIO, ITPO letter dated. 20.06.2024.</i></li> <li>❖ <i>We may provide the copies of concerned pages of the extra item officially sanctioned work, copies of test check reports and measuring books of the relevant documents is enclosed.</i></li> <li>❖ <i>CPIO/PIO is directed to be careful in future is hereby cautioned to dispose of an RTI only after taking due cognizance of the facts of each case.</i></li> </ul> <p><b><i>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</i></b></p>
2	ITPO/RTI/A/05/03/2024  Smt. Durgesh Nandni, SM, ITPO, New Delhi	<i>Reply as received is not appropriate and one month has been consumed without providing any accurate reply, or the copy of the relevant rules pages. Also, please provide the copy of the comments of the concerned Divisions, who have informed that the information sought is to be retrieved and compiled from multiple records and thus, involves considerable diversion of resources, with certificate on dead-line that how much time is required by them for providing the desired information. The point-wise question, reply and the appeal has been given below, for early providing of correct information.</i>	<p><i>The RTI application &amp; appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ <i>The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated.</i></li> <li>❖ <i>For the information sought in the original RTI, option to inspect available &amp; relevant records had already been given to the applicant. The applicant has agreed to the same. The applicant in her appeal has also sought additional information, copy of request received for transfer, certificate of confirmation for uploading of orders on website, inspection of personal file etc.) which were not part of the original RTI application.</i></li> <li>❖ <i>The outcome report of Beauty World Middle East, 2023 password of DOC portal for accessing the report as per reply of CPIO. DOC portal the link of the portal <a href="https://mai.commerce.gov.i">https://mai.commerce.gov.i</a></i></li> </ul>

			<p><a href="mailto:edoffice@itpo.gov.in">n, user name: edoffice@itpo.gov.in,</a> password: 583855.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>❖ Information as existing and available already provided. The applicant, in her appeal, has seems to sought additional information i.e. inspection of file for furnishing reports to CVC, guidelines received in ITPO since 2020.</li><li>❖ In the original RTI, the applicant had sought details of the candidates (past experience, qualifications), which is 3rd party information. For the remaining information, reference to ITPO website and option to inspect records had already been given to the applicant.</li><li>❖ The information/document sought by you regarding, matter of complaint of Mrs. Amrapali Dixit against Gauri Shankar is personal information of third party, disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest, or which would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual, qualifies for protection from disclosure u/s 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005.</li><li>❖ The name of Mr. Sanjay Vashisth, Manager was in- verdantly mentioned in place of Shri Vasudev, Manager. Shri Vasudev, Manager was a part of the team of Foreign buyer mobilization in Aahar 2022.</li><li>❖ The query in the original RTI had no mention of the duration for which status was sought. The applicant in her appeal has now specified the duration as 26 Sept - 10 June 2024 (in respect of Admin. Division). In reference to Status of action taken by Administration Division on her representation regarding Advisory dated 20.09.2023, the decision of the Competent Authority was conveyed to her vide email dated 27.05.2024. The information provided by Vigilance regarding her complaint has already been provided to her by</li></ul>
--	--	--	--



			<p>email dated. 13.05.2024.</p> <p>❖ It is informed that the PIO, ITPO had replied to the applicant vide letter No. ITPO/RTI/05/03/2024 dated 07.06.2024 that the details of the requisite information (photocopy 08 pages) can be obtained from the RTI Cell, ITPO, by depositing Rs. 16/- towards photocopying charges. However, the applicant did not come forward to collect the documents.</p> <p>❖ In this context this is to inform that Shri Rajnesh Kumar Naudiyal, Deputy Manager, Admin. Division, (E-I), and Smt. Meena Dogra, Assistant Manager, FS-I Division, has been nominated to arrange inspection of the relevant file(s) by the applicant on <b><u>26<sup>th</sup> July, 2024 (During office hours).</u></b> The confidential documents, which are exempt from disclosure, shall be severed as per Section 10 of the RTI Act, 2005. <b>The inspection shall be conducted in the Room of Shri. Brij Lal, CPIO &amp; General Manager at the given date and time situated at Room No. 15, 4<sup>th</sup> floor, New Admin. Building, Pragati Maidan, New Delhi – 110001.</b> Please also note that for inspection of file(s), no fee is charged for the first hour and a fee of Rupee five is charged for each subsequent hour (or fraction thereof) thereafter.</p> <p><b>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</b></p>
3.	ITPO/RTI/A/05/03/2024 Sh. Pankaj, SM,ITPO	<p><b>The applicant being unsatisfied with the decision of PIO, ITPO has submitted first Appeal before the First Appellate Authority, ITPO stating that:-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The reply to question at point no.6 has not been provided. Therefore, it may kindly be provided urgently before expire of One month of my initial RTI dated 20.07.2024</li> <li>➤ As regards point no.3 the exact clause/page no. of ITPO service regulation available in the notification-knowledge</li> </ul>	<p>The RTI application &amp; appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated.</li> <li>❖ As regards point no.6 information as available has been already provided to you. Question no. 5 and 6 both has the same answer, inadvertently, answer to question no. 5 and 6 were</li> </ul>

		<p>management- administration division of ITPO available on website may kindly be provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ As regards my question at point no.8 kindly confirm and provide a certificate that there is no rule of calculation of vacancies as per calendar year basis or financial year basis and only instruction/direction of competent authority are taken.</li><li>➤ Beside above, as per my RTI request, the undersigned would like to inspect all the relevant files and a suitable date and time may kindly be informed for the inspection</li><li>➤ Further, an amount of Rs.498 has been deposited towards photocopies charges of 249 pages@2/- per page. Copy of receipt is enclosed. Please provide relevant documents as per reply dated 15.07.2024.</li></ul>	<p>not merged. Further documents pertaining to reply of q.5&amp;6 (2 pages is enclosed) are now being provided (copy of the noting proposal duly approved by the competent authority) free of charge, as per provisions under section 7(6) of the RTI Act.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>❖ As regards point no.3 information already provided, however, <b>CPIO/PIO is required to supply the information/material in the form as held by the Public Authority but not to do research on behalf of the applicant to deduce anything from the material and then supply it to the applicant.</b></li><li>❖ As regards point no. 8 information as available already provided.</li><li>❖ In respect of point no. 11. As regards inspection of personal file of applicant. In this context this is to inform that Shri Suresh Kumar Chawla, Manager, ACR Unit, has been arrange inspection of the relevant file(s) by the applicant on <b>27<sup>th</sup> August, 2024</b> (During office hours). The confidential documents, which are exempt from disclosure, shall be severed as per Section 10 of the RTI Act, 2005. The inspection shall be conducted in the Room of Shri. Brij Lal, CPIO &amp; General Manager situated at Room No. 15, 4th floor, New Admin. Building, Pragati Maidan, New Delhi – 110001.</li><li>❖ Copy of relevant documents (249 pages), as mentioned our letter dated. 15.07.2024 is enclosed.</li><li>❖ CPIO/PIO is directed to be careful in future is hereby cautioned to dispose of an RTI only after taking due cognizance of the facts of each case</li></ul> <p><b>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</b></p>
--	--	---	---

Details of Appeal/Decision of First Appellate Authority for the period July to Sept. , 2024 under RTI Act 2005:

Sl. No.	ID No.	Ground of Appeal	Decision of First Appellate Authority/remarks
	<u><b>July' 2024</b></u>		
1		NIL	
	<u><b>August 2024</b></u>		
1	ITPO/RTI/A/07/03&04/2024  Sh. Shah Nawaj Khan, Delhi	<p>आवेदनकर्ता ने आवेदन किया कि वे 2005 के RTI अधिनियम के तहत सूचनाएं प्राप्त करने के लिए 19 अक्टूबर 2005 को सूचना आयोग के माध्यम से आवेदन किया था। सूचना आयोग ने सूचनाएं प्रदान करने से इंकार कर दिया। आवेदनकर्ता ने सूचना आयोग के निर्णय के खिलाफ अपील की।</p>	<p>आवेदनकर्ता ने सूचना आयोग के निर्णय के खिलाफ अपील की। सूचना आयोग ने सूचनाएं प्रदान करने से इंकार कर दिया। आवेदनकर्ता ने सूचना आयोग के निर्णय के खिलाफ अपील की।</p> <p>सूचना आयोग ने सूचनाएं प्रदान करने से इंकार कर दिया। आवेदनकर्ता ने सूचना आयोग के निर्णय के खिलाफ अपील की।</p> <p>सूचना आयोग ने सूचनाएं प्रदान करने से इंकार कर दिया। आवेदनकर्ता ने सूचना आयोग के निर्णय के खिलाफ अपील की।</p>

[illegible]



	Sh. Pankaj, SM, ITPO	<p><b><i>the decision of PIO, ITPO has submitted first Appeal before the First Appellate Authority, ITPO stating that:-</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ An amount of Rs.4 has been deposited towards photocopies charges of 04 pages@2/- per page as per RTI reply provided under point no 1 dated 27.09.2024. Copy of receipt is enclosed. Please provide photocopies.</li> <li>➤ As per reply provided under point no.2 kindly provide the year as reply is incomplete without mentioning the year after 15th November..</li> <li>➤ The reply at point no.3 indicates "no record is available". Please specific how the records of communication to Shri Pankj are not available. Who was dealing the work of ACR during that period. If, it was not handed over by previous incumbent or it was not communicated to Shri Pankaj. What does it specify.</li> <li>➤ As regard point no 4, the reply states "information not available in ACR Manual". Accordingly, kindly provide the copy of ACR manual also. Please specify in this case of Shri Pankaj, if the guidelines of ACR manual are applicable or APAR guidelines are applicable, as Shri Pankaj had submitted APAR for the year 2019-20 &amp; 2020-21 and not ACR. Please provide the copy of guidelines of APAR.</li> <li>➤ As regard point no 5, the reply is in contradiction to reply given at point no 1.</li> <li>➤ As regard point no 6 &amp; 7, if possible, kindly arrange the inspection in the first week of October.</li> </ul>	<p><i>appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated.</li> <li>❖ As regards point no.2 - No information available.</li> <li>❖ As regards point no.3 - Seeking clarification is not covered under the ambit of "Information" as defined u/s 2(f) of the RTI Act 2005.</li> <li>❖ As regards point no. 4 - APAR guidelines can be obtained from the SPARROW portal / available in hard copy of APAR format.</li> <li>❖ In this context, this is to inform that Shri Praful. S. Nair, M (ACR Unit), ITPO, New Delhi and Shri Rajnesh Kumar Naudiyal, Deputy Manager, Admin. Division, (E-I), has been nominated to arrange inspection of the relevant file(s) by the applicant on <b><u>21<sup>st</sup> or 22<sup>nd</sup> October, 2024 (During office hours)</u></b>. The confidential documents, which are exempt from disclosure, shall be severed as per Section 10 of the RTI Act, 2005. <b><i>The inspection shall be conducted in the Room of Shri. Brij Lal, CPIO &amp; General Manager at the given date and time situated at Room No. 15, 4<sup>th</sup> floor, New Admin. Building, Pragati Maidan, New Delhi – 110001.</i></b> Please also note that for inspection of file(s), no fee is charged for the first hour and a fee of Rupee five is charged for each subsequent hour (or fraction thereof) thereafter.</li> <li>❖ Copy of relevant documents (02 pages), as mentioned our letter dated. 25.09.2024 is enclosed.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</i></b></p>
--	----------------------	---	---

Details of Appeal/Decision of First Appellate Authority for the period Oct. to December. , 2024 under RTI Act 2005:

Sl. No.	ID No.	Ground of Appeal	Decision of First Appellate Authority/remarks
	<b><u>October 2024</u></b>		
1	ITPO/RTI/A/08/14/2024 Sh. Rohit Sonkar, Delhi.	<p><i>Kind reference is requested to reply given by PIO, vide above mentioned letter to my request for information submitted on 17th September 2024. In this regard it is submitted that the request has been denied under section 8(1)(h) of RTI Act 2005, on the pretext that in “respect of vigilance related inquiries and disciplinary matters, “investigation” includes all enquiries, verification of records, and assessment and is completed only after the competent authority makes its decision on it after receipt of the Inquiry report for the Inquiry officer. In this regard it is submitted that the denial of information has been done without any application of the mind by the PIO which is evident from facts mentioned below:-</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>1. The information requested at S.No.1 to 3 of letter No. ITPO/RTI/08/14/2024 dated. 17th September, 2024, pertains to review committee constituted by ITPO to review my suspension from the post of Manager. The minutes of the review committee held on 02.02.2022, 29.07.2022 and 20.01.2023 are nowhere related to inquiries, disciplinary proceedings being held against the undersigned. Even if the excuses for not providing the minutes of review committee are taken into account, it is a matter of fact that the suspension of the undersigned from the post of Manager was revoked on 29.01.2023 by ITPO. Therefore not providing the minutes of the review committee does not hold ground since suspension has already been revoked.</i></li><li><i>2. The information sought S.No. 4 of the letter No. ITPO/RTI/08/14/2024 dated. 17th September, 2024, pertains to applicability of Schedule I to IV of the Fundamental Rules (FR) issued by Government of India, whereas the reply by the PIO is totally irrelevant to the subject matter.</i></li><li><i>3. To support my case of non-application of mind by PIO by taking refuge under section 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act for not providing the information, judgments of High Court of Delhi and Central Information Commission (CIC) relevant to the present case is summarized is attached.</i></li></ol>	<p><i>The RTI application &amp; appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>➤ The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated</i></li><li><i>➤ Information sought, i.e. the certified true copies of the Minutes of forth, fifth and sixth Review Committee meeting, was denied under Section 8(1)(h)of RTI Act, 2005.</i></li><li><i>➤ It is submitted that as already informed the departmental inquiry against Shri Rohit Sonkar, Manager has not been completed as the decision of the competent authority is pending as per the direction of the Hon’ble CAT and a final order has not been issued by the Hon’ble CAT.</i></li><li><i>➤ Further, the O.A. filed by Sh. Rohit Sonkar is also pending in the Hon’ble CAT and a final order has not been issued by the Hon’ble CAT.</i></li><li><i>➤ Reply for S.No.4, is reiterated</i></li></ul> <p><b><i>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</i></b></p>
2	ITPO/RTI/A/08/15/2024 Sh. Pankaj, SM, ITPO, New	<i>The applicant/appellant, being unsatisfied</i>	<i>The RTI application &amp; appeal of the appellant and the information furnished</i>

	Delhi.	<p>with the provided information has submitted First Appeal dated 23.10.2024 before the FAA stating that:-</p> <p>With Reference to RTI application dated 28.08.2024, the undersigned was provided copies of note portion from page no. 48 to 76 of file no. 4-ITPO (11)/E- 1/2016 after inspection on 23.09.2024.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Here the undersigned desire to appeal to the Appellate Authority that there was biased approach of Administration division for showing the information to the undersigned during the inspection, as can be seen that Shri Asif Siraj was shown the information on marks assigned to other candidates in respect of education qualification for the DPC held on 16.01.2027, reference para 5 on page 48/n (copy enclosed).</li> <li>➤ It is therefore, requested that the undersigned should also be allowed to inspect the information as shown to Shri Asif Siraj. This is as per rule of equal opportunity to all as per constitution of India.</li> <li>➤ Else the same will be informed to Hon'ble Scheduled Tribe Commission for intervention as OBC candidate who was working in the Vigilance subsequently posted in the Administration Division and had access to sensitive information due to their place of posting, are shown the full information pertaining to other candidates without their consent in RTI inspection, whereas, ST candidate is denied the same information is a discrimination by ITPO.</li> <li>➤ All correspondence used/mentioned in this noting has not been provided to the undersigned.</li> </ul>	<p>by CPIO/PIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated.</li> <li>❖ The relevant documents were shown to applicant during the inspection carried out on 23.09.2024 as per RTI guidelines.</li> <li>❖ Further, the personal details of other official such as educational qualification etc. was redacted as confidential documents are exempted from disclosure as per Section 10 of the RTI Act, 2005.</li> <li>❖ As regards the RTI of another applicant, the same was a separate issue and not to be related to present RTI.</li> </ul> <p><b>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</b></p>
		<b><u>November, 2024</u></b>	
1	ITPO/RTI/A/09/07/2024 Smt. Durgash Nandani, SM, ITPO, New Delhi.	<p>The applicant/appellant, being unsatisfied with the provided information has submitted First Appeal dated 08.11.2024 before the FAA stating that:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is with reference to my RTI enquiry dated 11.9.2024 and the reply dated 11.10.2024(copy enclosed). The reply is factually incorrect and misleading. During inspection, it was seen that factually incorrect things were reported to higher management to issue the Advisory by Administration Division and then without the</li> </ol>	<p>The RTI application &amp; appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated</li> <li>➤ The applicant has not clearly specified the point of her RTI Application dated 09.11.2024 for which she did not receive the factually correct reply In absence of same, we are unable to provide any further information.</li> <li>➤ With regard to the points raised by the applicant in the first appeal, the concerned division has informed that the</li> </ul>



		<p>consent of the competent authority, Ms. Shrishti Jain, DM (Admn.) had informed that the competent authority has not approved the revoke of advisory, which is a misleading information.</p> <p>2. Further, inter-connected information was sought in RTI enquiry dated 11.9.2024, and this is the information related with justice to undersigned as the administration division has not informed the true facts to the higher management while issue of Advisory, Suppressed the information that the Tender was not created by me and Mr. Sanjay Vashisht, the then Manager, FS-I has left the work unattended without handing over after transfer.</p> <p>3. There were many contradictions in the note for seeking approval of the Advisory from the Competent Authority too.</p> <p>4. In spite of ED, ITPO asking that if anyone has been issued advisory by error or anybody left, the name of Mr. Sanjay Vashisht, was not informed or the complete facts of the case presented to him by administration.</p> <p>5. The matter of Ms. Shrishti Jain, DM (Admn.) giving misleading information to undersigned was raised in Vigilance Division too, but CVO directed that it is administrative matter. But till date no action has been taken against Ms. Shrishti Jain either by Vigilance or Administration Division, for giving misleading information and suppression of facts and inordinate delay in resolving the grievances in a time bound manner by administration division.</p> <p>6. <u><b>The RTI Cell and FS-I is again giving wrong information in RTI reply, as the first notice to Technical Evaluation Committee was issued in November 11, 2022 and not in February 13, 2023, as informed in the reply. Therefore, the penalty as per rules for providing wrong information by FS-I and RTI Cell may please be imposed.</b></u></p> <p><u><b>Therefore, it is once again requested that the information sought as per my RTI dated 11.9.2024 may please be given as sought against each question in the RTI, since the matter relates to my dignity and integrity, to take up the matter further with the higher management, as the employee of ITPO, there is no action from</b></u></p>	<p>applicant has already inspected the all relevant files and all the documents identified during the inspection have been provided to the applicant</p> <p>➤ As regards the reference to inter-connected information sought in RTI enquiry dated 11.09.2004. the applicant has not mentioned the items that were factually incorrect. In absence of same, we are unable to provide any further information.</p> <p>➤ The applicant has made an allegation of providing misleading information against an officer However, the applicant has not given any supporting document to substantiate the allegation</p> <p>➤ Date of formation of the Technical Evaluation Committee was 2 November, 2022 approved by the competent authority, ITPO and first notice for meeting was issued on 10 November 2022 and 13 February, 2023 which was eventually not held</p> <p>➤ Further to para A2, the matter related to wrong submission made to the management &amp; allegation in para D5 are internal matters of ITPO between SM(DNII) &amp; the Management. Dealing with discord between SM(DNB) &amp; Admin, or Management of ITPO etc does not appear to fall under ambit of RTI Act, CIC</p> <p>➤ In this context, the concerned division has informed that the date of formation of the Technical Evaluation Committee was 2nd November, 2022 approved by the competent authority, ITPO and first notice for meeting was issued on 10th November 2022 and 13th February, 2023 which was eventually not held.</p> <p><b>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</b></p>
--	--	--	--

[illegible]

		<p>             ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥              ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥              ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥              ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥ ॥॥॥              ॥॥॥           </p> <p>             2. ॥॥ ॥॥॥ ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥  <b>RTI</b> ॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥ 3, 4, 5              ॥॥॥ ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥ <b>RII</b> ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥              ॥॥॥॥ <b>8 (1) (j)</b> ॥॥ ॥॥॥              ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥ ॥॥              ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥              ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥              ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥ ॥॥॥              ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥ <b>RTI</b> ॥॥॥॥              ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ <b>8</b> ॥॥ ॥॥              ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥ ॥॥ <b>Provided</b>  <b>that the information which</b>  <b>cannot be denied to the</b>  <b>parliament or a state</b>  <b>legislature shall not be denied</b>  <b>to any person.</b> ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥              ॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥ ॥॥॥              ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥ ॥॥॥           </p> <p>             3. ॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥ 2              ॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥              ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ <b>ITPO</b>              ॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥,              ॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥              ॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥  <b>01/04/2024</b> ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥              ॥॥ ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥              ॥॥॥ ॥॥ ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥              ॥॥ ॥॥॥ ॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥              ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥              ॥॥ ॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥              ॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥              ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥              ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥              ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥              ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥ <b>CPIO</b>              ॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥              ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥ ॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥ ॥॥              ॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥              ॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥              ॥॥ ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥              ॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥              ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥           </p>
--	--	---

		<div>□□□</div> <div>□□□ □□□□□ □□ □□□□□□</div> <div>□□ □□ <i>PIO</i> □□□□□□ □□</div> <div>□□□□ □□ □□ □□ □□□□□</div> <div>□□ □□□□□□ □□ □□□□□</div> <div>□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□</div> <div>□□□□ □□ □□□□□ □□□□□□</div> <div>□□□□□</div>	
--	--	--	--

Details of Appeal/Decision of First Appellate Authority for the period **January 2025. to March. , 2025** under RTI Act 2005:

Sl. No	ID No.	Ground of Appeal	Decision of First Appellate Authority/remarks
	<b>January, 2025</b>		
	<b>NIL</b>		
	<b>February, 2025</b>		
1.	ITPO/RTI/A/01/04/2025 Sh. Ashok Kumar, DGM, ITPO	<p><i>IT Policy version 1.1 dated 20.6.2014 is not available on ITPO website under Knowledge Management Section – IT services Division</i></p> <p><b>Hence, False Information by IT Division/CPIO, who has not verified the information before giving to applicant.</b></p> <p><b>The documents between 27.1.2012 to 12.5.2016 are not available on ITPO website under Knowledge Management Section - IT services Division. The copy of the available on knowledge Management IT services division is enclosed documentary as evidence regarding false information by CPIO/IT Division.</b></p>	<p><i>The RTI application &amp; appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated.</i></li><li><i>IT Policy version 1.1 dated 20.06.20214 is available on ITPO website under knowledge management Section – IT Services Division – search with “User Information Technology Policy”. A copy also attached for reference please.</i></li><li><i>Total approx. 150 units of IT equipments(s) including Laptops, Printers and Desktop computers were purchased from 2018 to the present. The requested information is voluminous, the applicant may be requested to inspect available records, minimize &amp; prioritize the requirement. Shri Satish Kumar Sharma, Senior Assistant, has been nominated to arrange inspection of the relevant file(s) by the applicant on <u>11<sup>th</sup> March 2025 (During office hours)</u>. The confidential documents, which are exempt from disclosure, shall be severed as per Section 10 of the RTI Act, 2005. <b>The inspection shall be conducted in the Room of Shri. Brij Lal, CPIO &amp; General Manager at the given date and time situated at Room No. 15, 4<sup>th</sup> floor, New Admin. Building, Bharat Mandapam, New Delhi – 110001.</b></i></li><li><i>Latest DFPR available on ITPO website under Knowledge Management Section – Administration Division – search with “DFPR Amendment”, may be referred for delegation of financial powers.</i></li><li><i>At present, no compiled document exists detailing the Status (working condition,</i></li></ul>
		<p><i>Details were sought from IT Division but not provided. We require the requisitions of the concerned HOD/ Recommendation of the higher authority for purchase of laptops printers and desktops from 2018 onwards.</i></p>	
		<p><i>No IT Policy Version 1.1 dated 20. 6. 2014 is available on ITPO website, under Knowledge Management Section - IT services Division.</i></p> <p><b>Hence, False Information by IT Division/CPIO, who has not verified the information before giving to applicant.</b></p> <p><b>The documents between 27.1.2012 to 12.5.2016 are not available on ITPO website under Knowledge Management Section – IT services Division.</b></p> <p><b>The copy of the available on knowledge Management IT services division is enclosed as documentary evidence regarding false information by CPIO/IT Division.</b></p>	
		<p><i>No IT Policy Version 1.1 dated 20.6.2014 is available on ITPO website, under IT Knowledge Management Section</i></p> <p><b>The documents between 27.1.2012</b></p>	

		<p><b><i>to 12.5.2016 are not available on ITPO website under Knowledge Management Section - IT services Division.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Hence, False Information by IT Division/CPIO, who has not verified the information before giving to applicant.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>The copy of the available on knowledge Management IT services division is enclosed as documentary evidence regarding false information by CPIO/IT Division.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Details of the purchases especially made for the level of SM and above after 2019 No information has been provided.</i></b></p>	<p><i>scrap/condemn) of the laptops and printers that have been replaced since January 01, 2018. IT equipment is procured in line with technological advancements and operational needs. Older devices and peripherals are disposed off according to the organization's IT policy.</i></p> <p><b><i>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</i></b></p>
		<p>No IT Policy Version 1.1 dated 20.6.2014 is available on ITPO website, under IT Knowledge Management Section</p> <p><b>The documents between 27.1.2012 to 12.5.2016 are not available on ITPO website under Knowledge Management Section IT services Division</b></p> <p><b>Hence, False Information by IT Division/CPIO, who has not verified the information before giving to applicant.</b></p> <p><b>The copy of the available on knowledge Management IT services division is enclosed as documentary evidence regarding false information by CPIO/IT Division.</b></p>	
		<p>No IT Policy Version 1.1 dated 20.6.2014 is available on ITPO website, under IT Knowledge Management Section</p> <p><b><i>Hence, False Information by IT Division/CPIO, who has not verified the information before giving to applicant.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>The documents between 27.1.2012 to 12.5.2016 are not available on ITPO website under Knowledge Management Section - IT services Division.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>The copy of the available on knowledge Management IT services division is enclosed as documentary evidence regarding false information by CPIO/IT Division.</i></b></p>	

		<p><i>Latest DFPR not available on ITPO website under Knowledge Management Section IT - Services Division.</i></p> <p><i>The documents between 27.1.2012 to 12.5.2016 are not available on ITPO website under Knowledge Management Section - IT services Division.</i></p> <p><i>Hence, False Information by IT Division/CPIO, who has not verified the information before giving to applicant.</i></p> <p><i>The copy of the available on knowledge Management IT services division is enclosed as documentary evidence regarding false information by CPIO/IT Division.</i></p>	
		<p><i>False information, as no Laptop and no new printer has been issued as per my request dated 5.4.2024 (laptop), 14.8.2024 (laptop, desktop and new printer), 25.9.2024 (laptop, printer) Copies of the requests are enclosed as evidences.</i></p> <p><i>Hence, False Information by IT Division/CPIO, who has not verified the information before giving to applicant.</i></p>	
		<p>No IT Policy Version 11 dated 20.6.2014 is available on ITPO website, under IT Knowledge Management Section</p> <p>The documents between 27.1.2012 to 12.5.2016 are not available on ITPO website under Knowledge Management Section - IT services Division.</p> <p><b>Hence, False Information by IT Division/CPIO, who has not verified the information before giving to applicant.</b></p> <p><b>The copy of the available on knowledge Management IT services division is enclosed as documentary evidence regarding false information by CPIO/IT Division.</b></p>	
		<p><i>Please provide the deadline when this data will be compiled by IT Division, as this is required for informing the management about the corruption in IT Division for procurement without scrapping /condemn of the old laptops and</i></p>	

		printers.	
		<p>No IT Policy Version 1.1 dated 20.6.2014 is available on ITPO website, under IT Knowledge Management Section</p> <p><b>Hence, False Information by IT Division/CPIO, who has not verified the information before giving to applicant.</b></p> <p><b>The above documents between 27.1.2012 to 12.5.2016 are not available on ITPO website under Knowledge Management Section - IT services Division</b></p> <p><b>The copy of the available on knowledge Management IT services division is enclosed as documentary evidence regarding false information by CPIO/IT Division.</b></p> <p>Please provide the requisitions of officers/officials who have requested for Laptop since 2019 till date If the laptops are issued in order of receipt of requisitions in chronological order, or any specific criteria for issue of lap top, please provide the copy of the guidelines or instructions issued by the competent authority.</p>	
2	ITPO/RTI/A/01/05/2025 Sh. Ashok Kumar, DGM, ITPO	-	<p><i>The RTI application &amp; appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated.</i></li> <li><i>There is no such guidelines/policies/SOP of insertion of name and photograph of Key Management personnel/Head of Department in the Annual Report since 2012 to 2024. The names of General Managers/HoDs/DGMs who were operationally reporting to ED/CMD were included in the key Executives page of the Annual Report as per the precedent/past practice.</i></li> <li><i>The information/copies of Annual Report from 01.04.2012 to 01.04.2024 is available on ITPO's website.</i></li> <li><i>There is no such policy/guidelines of insertion/non-insertion of the name and photographs of HoD of EMD in the Annual Report FY 2022-23 and 2023-24.</i></li> </ul>
		<p>The reply is not clear/satisfactory, as when there is no such guidelines /policies / amendment / SOP of insertion of name and photographs of key management personnel / Head of Department in the Annual Report since 2012 to 2024 - <b>then how the insertions are being made for the period 2012 -2024, and who is the competent authority to decide on the insertions in Annual Report, is it YP, Manager, DGM, CS, ED, or CMD. Kindly certify or it is discretion of the printer who is printing the annual report. designation of Name and person the responsible/accountable for the error in annual report in the absence of any guideline/policies/amendments/SOP may please be provided, as per the work allocation in the CS Division.</b></p>	
		<p>Information sought is crystal clear and only copies of each Annual Report from 1.4.2012 to 1.4.2024 was sought, on which the insertion of names and photographs of Key Management Personnel are printed.</p> <p>Requested information may please be</p>	



		provided urgently.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>There is no such information available in C.S. Division regarding approval of the competent authority for inviting the HoDs for attending the AGM in 2023 and 2024. As per the precedent/past practice, GMs/HoDs/DGMs were invited to attend the AGM in 2023 and 2024.</li><li>Further, it may be mentioned here that vide CIC Decision No. 883/IC(A)/2007 dated 14.06.2007 (Copy attached) it is stated at para 5 that “the information seeker, being an employee of the respondent, is a part of the information provider. Under the RTI, the employees are not expected to question the decisions of the superior officers in the garb of seeking information. Such employees have access to internal mechanisms for redressal of their grievances. Applicant being information seeker and provider of the same system, should work together for evolving approaches to remove irritants. They ought to exercise restraints in misusing the Act, lest it should dilute the mandate of RTI Act to empower the common man.</li></ul> <p><b>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</b></p>
		As per duties and responsibilities in the advertisement for the post of CS issued by ITPO vide publication in Economic Times, Business Standard, Employment News, etc. dated 18.3.2013 (copy provided by RTI Cell), The Company Secretary is, inter alia, to maintain all the records and is responsible for printing of Annual Accounts and Director Report, Organising AGMs, etc.	
		<b>Thus, it is a false information from CS that no such information is available, and hence it is requested that the information sought by the applicant may please be provided without any further delay.</b>	
		Only the notice/email intimation/invitation for attending AGM is provided and the copy of the approval of the competent authority is not provided.	
		Hence, the approval of the competent authority for inviting HODs/DGMs for attending the AGM may please be provided.	
		As per duties and responsibilities in the advertisement for the post of CS issued by ITPO vide publication in Economic Times, Business Standard, Employment News, etc. dated 18.3.2013 (copy provided by RTI Cell), The Company Secretary is, inter alia, to maintain all the records and is responsible for printing of Annual Accounts and Director Report, Organising AGMs, etc.	
		<b>Thus, it is a false information from CS that no such information is available, and hence it is requested that the information sought by the applicant may please be provided without any further delay.</b>	
		-	
		-	
		-	
		As per duties and responsibilities in the advertisement for the post of CS issued by ITPO vide publication in Economic Times, Business Standard, Employment News, etc. dated 18.3.2013 (copy provided by RTI Cell), The Company Secretary is, inter alia, to maintain all the records and is responsible for printing of Annual Accounts and Director Report, Organising AGMs, etc.	
		<b>Thus, it is a false information from CS that no such information is available, and hence it is requested that the information sought by the applicant may please be provided without any</b>	

		<b>further delay.</b>	
		<p>As per duties and responsibilities in the advertisement for the post of CS issued by ITPO vide publication in Economic Times, Business Standard, Employment News, etc. dated 18.3.2013 (copy provided by RTI Cell), The Company Secretary is, inter alia, to maintain all the records and is responsible for printing of Annual Accounts and Director Report, Organising AGMs, etc.</p> <p><b>Thus, it is a false information from CS that no such information is available, and hence it is requested that the information sought by the applicant may please be provided without any further delay. Copy of the whatsapp message dated 13.9.2024 is enclosed as a proof of evidence for false information by CS Division to the applicant - hence attract penalty as per RTI Act 2005.</b></p>	
		<p>As per duties and responsibilities in the advertisement for the post of CS issued by ITPO vide publication in Economic Times, Business Standard, Employment News, etc. dated 18.3.2013 (copy provided by RTI Cell), The Company Secretary is, inter alia, to maintain all the records and is responsible for printing of Annual Accounts and Director Report, Organising AGMs, etc.</p> <p><b>Thus, it is a false information from CS that no such information is available, and hence it is requested that the information sought by the applicant may please be provided without any further delay.</b></p>	
		<p>As per duties and responsibilities in the advertisement for the post of CS issued by ITPO vide publication in Economic Times, Business Standard, Employment News, etc. dated 18.3.2013 (copy provided by RTI Cell), The Company Secretary is, inter alia, to maintain all the records and is responsible for printing of Annual Accounts and Director Report, Organising AGMs, etc.</p> <p><b>Thus, it is a false information from CS that no such information is available, and hence it is requested that the information sought by the applicant may please be provided without any further delay.</b></p>	
		<p>The information was sought from as per ITPO Conduct Rules, which is still pending and may be provided urgently, without further delay.</p>	
		<i>Contrary information, as provided at Point No.15.</i>	
		<i>The deadline for action complete may be provided or else, the copy of the action taken so far may be provided urgently, without further delay, as the complaint is pending for more than two months.</i>	
		-	

		<i>The inspection of all the information sought is still pending, and may be facilitated urgently, as the undersigned is due for superannuation on February 28, 2025.</i>	
3.	ITPO/RTI/A/01/06/2025 Sh. Sunil Kumar, Delhi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ <i>Information not provided.</i></li> <li>❖ <i>According to RTI Act 2005 please move to application concern department.</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>The RTI application &amp; appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>The reply dated. 06.02.2025 furnished by the CPIO in response to RTI application dated. 11.01.2025 of the appellant found to be in order.</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Information has been already provided to you vide our letter dated. 06.02.2025. No further information is available on the point raised by the applicant.</i></li> </ul> <p><b><i>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</i></b></p>
4.	ITPO/RTI/01/08/2025 Sh. Pankaj, SM, ITPO	<p><b>The applicant being unsatisfied with the decision of PIO, ITPO has submitted first Appeal before the First Appellate Authority, ITPO stating that:-</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Regarding Point No. 1,2,3,5,8,13,16,17,18,22,23. and 24 :-</b> Kindly provide the e-file No.11042(11)/2/2023Admin-ITPO note no 1 to 332 and its annexure as shown in the inspection held on 13.02.2025. Kindly inform the amount to be deposited for the same.</li> <li><b>2. Regarding point No.4:-</b> It has been informed that “No such information is available”, the reply is not satisfactory, as the information is very essential for appointment and a confirmation is required that the employees of the ITPO do not have any official links / contacts / administrative ministry/NBCC, etc. or business relations with ITPO. The same is also the case for applying for ITPO employees while seeking NOC for employment with other agencies, therefore, the reply from RTI is not as per the conduct rules of ITPO.</li> <li><b>3. Regarding the Point No.6:-</b> Regarding the point no.6, it has been mentioned that "The ODs are uploaded in the PIS as and when the concerned HOD approves it." The information provided is not relevant, as</li> </ol>	

		<p>the question was whether the marital ceremonies could be performed while on OD or, the official work assigned/outcome report sought, before approving the ODs. Also, the reply for NOC for visit abroad is pending, which may kindly be provided.</p> <p><b>4. Regarding the Point No. 7:-</b> The action taken for outstanding payment of ITF, 2023 whereas the approval of the competent authority for extension of tenure of Young Professional, in spite of outstanding payment is still awaited provide Kindly the information sought, along with inspection of the file.</p> <p><b>5. Regarding the Point No. 11,12,14,15 &amp; 20:-</b> the undersigned is not satisfied with the reply and the inspection on the same is still pending. Kindly arrange the inspection urgently.</p> <p><b>6. Regarding the Point No. 21:-</b> The reply by RTI is "the information is sought is not clear". Hence, the inspection of the relevant documents which describe the core activities of ITPO and the activities assigned to various agencies in ITPO may please be arranged urgently.</p> <p><b>7. Regarding the Point No. 16, 22 &amp; 23:-</b> The relevant file was under submission and the inspection could not be done. Therefore, kindly intimate the date for inspection of the same.</p>	
	<b>March, 2025</b>		
1.	ITPO/RTI/A/02/03/2025 Sh. Rohit Sonkar, Delhi	<p><b><i>The applicant being unsatisfied with the decision of PIO, ITPO has submitted first Appeal before the First Appellate Authority, ITPO stating that:-</i></b></p> <p><i>Kind reference is requested to reply given by PIO, vide above mentioned letter to my request for information submitted on 13.02.2025. In this regard it is submitted that the request has been denied under section 8(1) (h) of RTI Act 2005, on the pretext that decision of competent authority is</i></p>	<p><i>The RTI application &amp; appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ <i>The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated</i></li><li>➤ <i>Information sought, i.e. the certified true copies of the Minutes of third, fourth, fifth and sixth Review Committee meeting, was denied under Section 8(1)(h) of RTI Act, 2005 at the time of original application.</i></li></ul>

		<p><i>pending w.r.t to Disciplinary proceedings initiated against the undersigned due to stay order given by Hon'ble Central Administrative Tribunal. In this regard it is submitted that the denial of information has been done without any application of the mind by the PIO.</i></p>	<p>➤ <i>It is submitted that as already informed the departmental inquiry against Shri Rohit Sonkar, Manager has not been completed as the decision of the competent authority is pending as per the direction of the Hon'ble CAT not to pass any final order in the disciplinary proceedings against Shri Rohit Sonkar..</i></p> <p>➤ <i>Further, the O.A. filed by Sh. Rohit Sonkar is also pending in the Hon'ble CAT and a final order has not been issued by the Hon'ble CAT.</i></p> <p><b><i>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</i></b></p>
--	--	---	--



1	ITPO/RTI/A/02/07/2025 Smt. Prem Wati, Delhi	1	<i>The date of joining of late Sh. Badlu Singh, Ex-Security Guard, Emp. No. 00494 in Ex-TFAI as per records in 20<sup>th</sup> August, 1982.</i>
		2.	<i>The date of retirement of Late Sh. Badlu Singh from the services of ITPO (Ex-TFAI) as per records is 31<sup>st</sup> January, 2008.</i>
		3	<i>Sh. Badlu Singh rendered 25 yeas 05 Months service in ITPO.</i>
		4	<i>As per records, O.O.No./Admn./166/2008, dt. 06/02/2008, was issued to release an amount of Rs. 1,43,852/- as DCRG and an O.O.No./Admn./2478/09 dt. 23/09/2009 was issued to release an amount of Rs. 55,916/- as arrear of DCRG due to revision of pay scale w.e.f. 01.01.2007, except CPF and GSLIS. (copies enclosed).</i>
		5	<i>PF Contribution of employees is deposited with the ITPO ECPF Trust.</i>
		6	<i>The PF Number of Sh. Badlu Singh was 501 under ITPO ECPF Trust.</i>
		7	<i>As per records, total PF amount was Rs. 2,96,248/- in r/o Sh. Badlu Singh under PF A/C No. 501.</i>
		8	<i>A Cheque amounting to Rs. 2,96,248/- (cheque no. 213913) was issued to Sh. Badlu Singh on 22.04.2008 against full and final payment of PF deposit.</i>
		9	<i>There are two pensions available for employees of ITPO. (1). Through ITPO, NPS Trust and (2). EPS'95 through EPFO. - NPS Trust: Pension through ITPO Employees Defined Contribution Superannuation Trust is available for employees who were serving as on 1<sup>st</sup> January, 2007 later. - EPFO: EPS'95 is applicable only for serving during the period of 1<sup>st</sup> November 2011 to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2024.</i>
		10	<i>In case of deceased employee, the nominee may deposit Rs. 5,000/- as one time employee share with ITPO Employees Defined Contribution Superannuation Trust for pension benefit through the ITPO Employees Defined Contribution Superannuation Trust.</i>
		11	<i>As mentioned above, the employee / Nominee (in case of deceased employee) has yet</i>

			<i>not deposited Rs. 5,000/- as employee share to ITPO's NPS Trust.</i>
		12	<i>Same as answer Point No. 4.</i>
		13	<i>The information sought is not clear. As per the records available in the Administration Division (E-I Section), it is informed that at present, ITPO provides medical facilities to its serving employees as per rules.</i>
		14	<i>The information sought is a question and does not fall under the RTI Act.</i>
		15	<i>Employer share of Rs. 9,259/- towards pension contribution stands payable from ITPO's NPS Trust for the want of employee share.</i>
		16	<i>The information sought is not clear. However, as per the records available in the Administration Division (E-I Section), it is informed that the employees who joined ITPO prior to 2012 are covered under Group Savings Insurance Scheme Master Policy GSLIC of Life Insurance Corporation of India. The amount of the policy is provided to the employees when they are relieved from the services of ITPO.</i>
		17	<i>Same as answer Point No. 9</i>
		18	<i>Applicant is requested to provide date and subject matter of the office order to fetch out the record, if available.</i>
2	ITPO/RTI/A/04/10/2025 Adv. Siddharth Gupta, Delhi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ "The PIO/APIO, ITPO provided Incomplete, Misleading or False Information"</li> <li>❖ I, Adv Siddharth Gupta, hereby file this first appeal under Section 19(1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005, against the deliberate and unlawful denial of documents requested for the civil works projects namely, the construction of retaining wall (Tender Ref No: 180/ITPO/Engg/2023-24/Rwall) and there placement of old damaged lights at Hall No. 7 (A-H), 8-11, 12-12A, VIP Lounge Hall No. 7, and street lights at Pragati Maidan, New Delhi.</li> </ul>	<p>The information sought for by the applicant in his aforesaid RTI applications, the information/replies furnished to the applicant by the PIO and APIO and the points raised in the aforesaid Appeal filed by the appellant have been examined carefully and the information as given below is furnished to the Appellant in respect of the present Appeal:-</p> <p>1. In the matter of "Construction of retaining wall (Tender Ref No: 180/ITPO/Engg/2023-24/Rwall)", certified photocopies of information containing 108 pages (including Note Sheets, MB Abstract &amp; measurement books and test check reports) are enclosed.</p>



			<p>2. In the matter of "Replacement of Old damaged light with new lights of Hall No. 7(A-H), 8-11,12-12A, VIP lounge Hall No.7 and street light at Pragati Maidan, New Delhi", photocopies of 99 pages (including 2nd and final bill statement, Deviation Statement and Measurement book (MB)) are enclosed.</p> <p>3. Reply to the points raised in the appeal could be provided only now as the information sought was scattered, pertaining to multiple projects and multiple divisions.</p> <p><b>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</b></p>
	<b>July, 2025</b>		
1	ITPO/RTI/A/05/05/2025 Sh. Akshay, DM, ITPO	<p>❖ <i>Information not provided.</i></p> <p>❖ Sir, the RTI application contained specific, unambiguous queries related to compliance with Central Vigilance Commission (CVC) guidelines on sensitive posts, implementation of CVC Circular No. 22/10/22 dated 25.10.2022, details of rotation and transfer of Group 'A' officers from sensitive posts, and policy-related documents. However, the responses received are generalized, evasive, and appear to have been issued with mala fide intent to deny information without invoking any valid exemption under Sections 8 or 9 of the Act.</p>	<p><i>The RTI application and the appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO have been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>Point No. 1&amp;2. – The reply already furnished to the applicant is reiterated.</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Point No. 3. – Information as existing and available already provided to the applicant</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Point No.4. – Information already provided. The applicant is requested to inspect the relevant documents.</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Point No.5. – No such compiled list is being maintained. Compilation of information from files/records would lead to disproportionate diversion of manpower. Accordingly, the applicant is advised to inspect the available records.</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Point No. 6. – Information already provided. It is informed that the transfer and posting are done with the approval of the Competent Authority keeping in view need and requirement of the Organization. In ITPO the following divisions/units have been identified as sensitive divisions:- BDD, FS-I, FS-II, F&amp;B, Admin.(Store), Finance, Vigilance and EMD.</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Point No. 7. – Applicant is advised to inspect</i></li> </ul>

			<p>available records/file.</p> <p>➤ Point No. 8. – No such compiled list is being maintained. Compilation from files/records would lead to disproportionate diversion of manpower. Accordingly, applicant is advised again to inspect the available records.</p> <p><b>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</b></p>
2	ITPO/RTI/A/06/02/2025 Sh. Rakesh Kumar, Samalkha, Delhi	<p>❖ <i>Provided Incomplete, Misleading or False Information.</i></p> <p>❖ <i>This is a first appeal under Section 19(1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005. I filed an RTI (No. ITPOR/R/E/25/00031 dated 03.06.2025) with ITPO asking for some very basic, department-specific information. But instead of giving what's on record, the Public Information Officer(Shri Saurabh Yadav, APIO) gave a vague, cut-paste style response dated 25.06.2025 (Ref: ITPO/RTI/06/02/2025), dodging almost every question and hiding facts. Frankly speaking, it's not a reply — it's an insult. I wasn't asking for secret nuclear codes or thousands of pages of 20-year-old data. I asked simple, specific questions about names of officers, postings, sensitive departments as per CVC, and resignations after promotion. These are normal records that should be available in any well-run department. Instead, I got evasion, misdirection, and some irrelevant names to confuse me.</i></p>	<p>The RTI application, the ITPO's reply to the applicant, the subsequent Appeal of the appellant and the information/inputs furnished by concerned Divisions in ITPO have been examined carefully by the undersigned and the following reply is being furnished to the applicant in respect of the Appeal:-</p> <p>➤ Regarding Point No.- 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9 and 14 as informed earlier, the information requested is not consolidated at a single source and is dispersed across multiple files. The collection and collation of such dispersed information would disproportionately divert the resources. Accordingly, an alternative mode of access – inspection, which is permissible under section 2(j)(i) of the Act was offered to the applicant.</p> <p>➤ Regarding Point No. - 10, 11, 12 and 13 - Reply as provided in respect of the RTI application is reiterated.</p> <p>➤ Regarding Point No. 15 - The following officers from ITPO had been promoted and resigned as under:-</p> <p>(1). Mrs. Nazneen Begum, Ex-Sr. Manager (Resigned) – dated. 29.09.2023.</p> <p>(2). Shri. Praful S. Nair, Ex-Sr. Manager (Resigned) – dated. 06.06.2025.</p> <p><b>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</b></p>