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	"Details not provided." 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.	<ul> <li>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:</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
			With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed off.
2.	ITPO/RTI/Appeal/04/06/2021 Sh. Mahipal Singh, Delhi	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.	<ul> <li>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 :</li> <li>Replies to your queries has already been furnished time and again.</li> <li>It is to inform that you have been repeating RTIs/Appeals of similar natures time and again.</li> <li>It is 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 :</li> <li>(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. (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:</li> </ul>

			<ul> <li>No Scope of repeating under RTIAct.</li> <li>Citizen has no right to repeat.</li> <li>Repetition shall be ground of Refusal.</li> <li>Appeals can be rejected.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>The copies of earlier appeal/orders viz. ITPO and CIC on the same subject are enclosed for ready reference.</li> <li>Kindly note that no further RTI / Appeal on the same subject will be entertained by ITPO.</li> <li>With these remarks, the appeal stands rejected.</li> </ul>
3.	ITPO/RTI/Appeal/05/03/2021 Sh. Israr Beg, New Delhi-14	<ul> <li>The information / reply provided by CPIO, ITPO is not correct.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>It is therefore, requested that as per Section 2(f) of RTI Act 2005, I may be provided the desired information.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>Other information is not available in ITPO</li> </ul>

			record this is already informed to you vide our letter dated. 17.06.2021 With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.
4.	ITPO/RTI/Appeal/04/06/2021 Sh. Mahipal Singh, Delhi.	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>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 :</li> <li>Replies to your queries has already been furnished time and again.</li> <li>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 :</li> <li>(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 appeal or answer another application or perform other public duty and</li> <li>(ii) Every repetition of RTI Application which was earlier</li> </ul>
			responded will be an obstruction to flow of information and defeats the purpose of the RTI Act. CIC

			thus, decided that:
			• No Scope of repeating under
			RTIAct.
			Citizen has no right to
			repeat. • Repetition shall be ground of
			Refusal.
			<ul> <li>Appeals can be rejected.</li> </ul>
			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.
			The copies of earlier
			appeal/orders viz. ITPO and
			CIC on the same subject are enclosed for ready reference.
			enclosed for ready reference.
			Kindly note that no further RTI
			/ Appeal on the same subject
			will be entertained by ITPO.
			With these remarks, the
			appeal stands rejected.
5	ITPO/RTI/Appeal/02/05/2021	The appellant was not satisfied	After having perused the
	Sh. K.P.S. Yadav, Ghaziabad	with the reply and filed the appeal after lapsing of	RTI application, reply furnished by PIO, and
		more than 04 months on July 28,	reasons raised in
		2021 as against the 30 days time	your 1sl Appeal, it is
		limit prescribed under Section 19(1) of the RTI	reiterated that information sought by you is a third
		Act 2005.	party information
		The appeal has been filed on the	and qualified for protection from disclosure under
		The appeal has been filed on the pretext that Shri Manish Yadav,	Section 8(1)0) as already
		has falsely acquired	conveyed to
		the OBC NCL certificate despite being in creamy layer. In order to dig out corruption	you by CPIO/PIO vie letter dated 08.03.2021.
		and being transparency in	With these remarks, the
		governance, OBC Certificate may	appeal stands disposed of.
		be provided under RTI.	

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	<ul> <li>The information / reply provided by CPIO, ITPO is not correct.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>It is therefore, requested that as per Section 2(f) of RTI Act 2005, I may be provided the desired information.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>Other information is not available in ITPO record this is already informed to you vide our letter dated. 17.06.2021</li> <li>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</li> </ul>
2.	ITPO/RTI/Appeal/04/06/2021 Sh. Mahipal Singh, Delhi.	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.	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 :
		His Second Appeal filed with CIC has also been disposed off	Replies to your queries has already been

during personal hearing on December 15, 2020 wherein	furnished time and again.
CPIO and officers from Finance and Admin were present.	It is to inform that you have been repeating BTIs(Appeals of similar
He has been filing RTIs with	RTIs/Appeals of similar natures time and again.
various Authorities on similar	In this regard you have
grounds, one of which was	also been informed about
received from Karkardooma	the decision of CIC { No.
Court (December 2020) and other from Department of	CIC/AD/A/2013/001326- SA dated 25.06.2014}
Commerce (March 2021) which were duly replied.	wherein it is stated that :
were any repred.	(i) Even a single repetition
The applicant has filed Appeal	of RTI Application would
dated 16.04.2021 with the	demand the valuable time
Department of Commerce after his RTI of 19.03.2021	of the PA/FAA and if it also reaches second
regarding release of pension	appeal, that of
benefits under CCS Rules of the	Commission, which time
GOI.	could have been spent to
	hear another appeal or answer another
	application or perform
	other public duty and
	(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:
	• No Scope of repeating
	under RTIAct.
	• Citizen has no right to
	repeat. • Repetition shall be
	• Repetition shall be ground of Refusal.
	• Appeals can be rejected.
	The query raised by you is
	strictly not covered under Section 2(f) of the RTL Act
	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.
	The copies of earlier
	appeal/orders viz. ITPO
	and CIC on the same
	subject are enclosed for
	ready reference.
	Kindly note that no further
	RTI / Appeal on the same

3	ITPO/RTI/Appeal/02/05/2021 Sh. K.P.S. Yadav, Ghaziabad	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. 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.	subject will be entertained by ITPO. With these remarks, the appeal stands rejected. After having perused the RTI application, reply furnished by PIO, and reasons raised in your 1sl 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 vie letter dated 08.03.2021. With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.
4	ITPO/RTI/Appeal/09/03/2021 Sh. Harinarayan Pathak, Guwahati	<ul> <li>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:</li> <li>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 afterter completion".</li> <li>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.</li> <li>But, unfortunately, CPIO, ITPO, New Delhi, inadvertently, could not furnishing such</li> </ul>	of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is

		Documentary Proofs/Records, held by ITPO, New Delhi. > 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.	
5	ITPO/RTI/Appeal/09/10/2021 Sh. Rohit Sonkar, Delhi	<ul> <li>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:</li> <li>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.</li> <li>2. Secondly, CIC ruling whose reference is quoted unequivocally.</li> </ul>	The RTI application & 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. 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. With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed off.

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> <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 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> <li>"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."</li> </ul>	<ul> <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:-         <ul> <li>"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;"</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></li></ul>
2.	ITPO/RTI/A/01/06/2022 Sh. R.K. Suneja, N.D	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. My questions were – 1. Is there any rule regarding the refund of payment made for booking stalls in the fairs organized	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. Q.2 During last 3 years

		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. 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. They answer me what they do "Generally", but do not reply that if it is "compulsorily" mandatory or not. Q2–Not answered. Q3–Notanswered. So, this is requested you that please give me answers to all 3 questions, and the answers should be specific, not generally.	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. Q.3 Reply same as per S.No. 2 above.
3.	ITPO/RTI/A/12/04,05,08&09 /2021 (04 Appeal Replay) Sh. Rohit Sonkar, ND	The Appellant being not contented with the information provided by PIO, filed Ist 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> <li>The reply provided under RTIs is reiterated.</li> <li>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;"</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>

			• 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.
			• 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
1			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.
4		This is with reference to your ended!	O It may be marting at
4	ITPO/RTI/04/06/2021	This is with reference to your appeal	2. It may be mentioned
	Sh. Mahipal Singh, Delhi	dated 24.01.2022 filed with	that you have been filing
	sii. mainpai singii, Dollii	Department of Commerce against	similar RTIs with one or the
		your RTI Application filed with DPE on	other Authority time and
		27.12.2021 and in-turn received in	again. And it has been time
		ITPO as transfer through DoC on	and again mentioned that the

		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.	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
5	ITPO/RTI/A/01/01,02,04&05 /2022 (04 Appeal Reply)	The Appellant being not contented with the information provided by PIO, filed Ist Appeal(s) before the	• The reply provided under RTI is reiterated.
	Sh. Akshay, New Delhi	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> <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 "Information" means any material in any form, including records, documents, memos, emails, 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;"</li> <li>The Departmental Inquiry under</li> </ul>
			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 etc.

- 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.
- 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 3rd Party and does not serve larger public interest, it has been denied.

Further, 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
			<i>information and therefore,</i> <i>defeats the purpose of RTI Act.</i>
6.	ITPO/RTI/A/01/03/2022 Sh. Akshay, New Delhi	The Appellant being not contented with the information provided by PIO, filed Ist 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> <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>
			"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;"
			<ul> <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 Ist Appeal(s) before the FAA, ITPO stating that PIO denied the information on baseless and flimsy grounds in a	<ul> <li>The reply provided under RTI is reiterated.</li> <li>The composition of the Review Committees (Ist, 2<sup>nd</sup> &amp; 3rd) were already provided to the</li> </ul>

		mechanical way without going in detail with what information had been sought for under the ambit of RTI act.	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.
			• 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.
			<ul> <li>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.</li> </ul>
			<ul> <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	ITPO/RTI/A/01/08/2022	The Appellant being not contented with the information provided by PIO, filed lst	The reply provided under RTI is reiterated.
	Sh. Akshay, New Delhi	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.	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",

			<ul> <li>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.</li> <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 online booking system for AAHAR 2020 etc.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
			<ul> <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	The Appellant being not contented with the information provided by PIO, filed Ist	<ul> <li>The allegation of the applicant against the</li> </ul>
	Sh. Ashok Kumar, SM, ITPO	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.	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. • The reply provided in

	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.
	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.
	<ul> <li>With these remarks,</li> </ul>
	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 April 2022 to July 2022 under RTI Act 2005:

Ashok Kumar, New Delhi       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 or knowingly provided the incomplete, incorrector misleading information.       appeal of the information further has been exami- the following of the RTI has         C       The reply provided the incomplete, incorrector misleading information.       □       The application inspected the following of the RTI has         Description       □       The application information.       □       The application inspected the following of the RTI has         Description       □       The application information.       □       The application inspected the following of the RTI has         Description       □       The application information.       □       The application inspected the following of the said office order to the complete holding B2C every scenario         Description       □       The application information.       □         Description       □       The application inspected the following of the complete terms and cond 2021 were put of the Complete the complete	oproval of the ovt. Agency for vent in Covid 19 s received on
applicant wher view that if the information employee of th himself is a par- information pr RTI, the em expected to que decisions of officiers in the information. St have access mechanisms f their grievance exercise restra the Act, lest th the mandate of to empower the □ Another dec be referred in Uma Kanti &aa Ramesh Chane Vidhyalaya wh the Responden not to cons applications Appellant and RTI cannot be turn vendetta of an his Organisation grievance tha against it. □ With thes	t up for approval petent Authority of CIC in the case ijayakumaran Nair t of Post, e referred by the rein CIC is of the seeker is an he respondent, he rt of the rovider. Under the appoyees are not estion the f the superior e garb of seeking uch employees s to internal for redressal of es. They ought to aints in misusing hey should dilute f RTI Act e common man. cision of CIC may the case of Smt. mp; Shri dra Vs. Navodaya herein CIC directs ts sider the RTI- filed by this his wife since the ned into a tool for employee against for some at one harbours

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 or knowingly provided the incomplete, incorrect or misleading information.	The RTI application & amp; appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:- □ The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated. □ 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 □ 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 □ 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 & quot;Internal Grievance Redressal Committee in accordance with NCSC letter dated 29 07 2020, information on which was already provided
			to applicant. $\Box$ 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 mpede the process of investigation or apprehension or prosecution of offenders is exempted from disclosure $\Box$ With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of. A copy of this decision be sent to the appellant may prefer an appeal u/s 19(3) of the RTI Act
3.	ITPO/RTI/04/14/2022	The applicant had filed RTI application vide Registration No.	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. Since the information pertains to your office, the

	Jayanta Kumar Das, Orisa	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 & Industries, New Delhi. The RTI had been transferred to DPIIT dated. 26/04/2022. 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, Stya Nagar, Sida Mahabir Patana, Puri-752002 (Odisha). A copy of the 1 <sup>st</sup> Appeal Application received is attached for your reference.	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	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 or knowingly provided the incomplete, incorrect or misleading information.	<ul> <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/com ments 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.	ITPO/RTI/04/07/2022	The Appellant being not contented	•	The reply provided in
	Ashok Kumar, New Delhi	with the information provided by CPIO, filed Ist Appeal(s) before the	-	respect of the RTI has been reiterated. An interim reply was
		FAA, ITPO stating that PIO	•	provided to the
		deliberately concealed the vital		applicant vide PIO
		information and requisite documents and have not provided the required		reply dated
		information and documents and		13.05.2022 since the
		deliberately denied the requisite		information sought by
		information or knowingly provided the		the applicant was to
		incomplete, incorrect or misleading		be provided by various Divisions.
		information.		Moreover, all were
				busy in pre-fair
				activities in organising
				AAHAR 2022 which
				was to be opened on
				April 26, 2022.
			٠	With regard to
				unanswered/remainin
				g queries, the reply is provided as above
				based on the inputs
				provided by the
				concerned Divisions.
			•	The applicant has
				been filing repeated
				RTIs/Appeals which prima fascia appears
				to be not in public
				interest. Further,
				compilation of
				information on such
				RTIs/Appeals causes unwarranted
				diversion of available
				human resources.
			•	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 fascia appears
				to be vindictive.
			•	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
1				Vijayakumaran Nair

			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 & 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.
			<ul> <li>With these remarks, the appeal stands</li> </ul>
			the appeal stands disposed of. A copy
			of this decision be
			sent to the appellant
			and CPIO, ITPO.
6.	ITPO/RTI/04/08-11/2022	Four Nos. of 1 <sup>st</sup> Appeal Applications are	NBCC, being Project
		received in ITPO from Shri Kuldeep of	Management Consultant (PMC),
	Kuldeep, New Dehi	Delhi seeking information pertaining to	all the RTIs received from the
		various points for Re-development of	appellant were transferred to
		ITPO Complex into Integrated Exhibition- Cum-Convention Centre (IECC) at Pragati	NBCC vide PIO, ITPO letter No. ITPO/RTI/04/08,09,10&11/2022
		Maidan, New Delhi on Design,	dated. 22/04/2022 as per
		Engineering, Procurement and	provision u/s 6(3) of the RTI Act,
		Construction (EPC) basis including	2005 for providing the requisite
		operation & Maintenance" by India Trade	information directly to the
		Promotion Organisation (ITPO).	applicant
			The applicant has informed that
			no reply is received within thirty days of the receipt of the
	l		

			request whether it has been accepted or rejected under Sections 8 and 9 and RTI Act 2005.
7.	ITPO/RTI/04/02/2022 Abdul Wahid, Ghaziabad		
			<pre>&gt;</pre>
8.	ITPO/RTI/05/08/2022	The Appellant being not satisfied with	The RTI application & appeal
	Neelu Paliwal	the information provided by PIO, filed	of the appellant and the
		Ist Appeal before the FAA, ITPO stating	information furnished by CPIO
		that "letter dated 31.05.2022 has been	has been examined carefully
		forwarded, did not get any reply. Please	and the following order is
		provide the information against this."	passed:-
			• The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated. No response is received from CII as yet to our letter dated 31.05.2022. Another reminder dated July 27, 2002 has been sent to CII.

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	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:-         > Details not provided.         > Provided Incomplete, Misleading or False Information.	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>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. With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</li> </ul>
2.	ITPO/RTI/08/11/2022 Sh. Vivek Sharma Bhiwadi, Rajasthan	<ul> <li>Details not provided.</li> <li>Provided Incomplete, Misleading or False Information.</li> <li>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</li> </ul>	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. With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.

3.	ITPO/RTI/08/03&04/2022 Shri Kuldaan	criminal offences in PSU / PSB & hence exposing them involve larger public interest. Re-development of ITPO Complex into	The RTIs dated 29 <sup>th</sup> July 2022
	Shri. Kuldeep New Delhi	Integrated Exhibition-Cum-Convention Centre (IECC) at Pragati Maidan, New Delhi on Design, Engineering, Procurement and Construction (EPC) basis including operation & Maintenance" by India Trade Promotion Organisation (ITPO).	received from the applicant were transferred to NBCC vide ITPO's letter Nos. ITPO/RTI/08/03&04/2022 dated. 08/08/2022 as per provision u/s 6(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
		The applicant has now informed that no reply is received within thirty days of the receipt of the request.	It is therefore requested necessary action may be taken, by FAA, NBCC, as per provision u/s 6(3) of the RTI Act, 2005, directly to the applicant, under intimation to ITPO.
4.	ITPO/RTI/02/04/2023 Sh. Ashok Kumar, Gurgram	<ul> <li>No response has been given by the authority with respect to the current RTI nor any kind of objection have been raised.</li> <li>PIO did not send reply.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>➢ Information has been already provided to the applicant vide CPIO/PIO, ITPO letter No. ITPO/RTI/02/04/2023 dated. 15.03.2023 (copy enclosed) in reply to your RTI Application No. NIL dated. 08.02.2023 received in ITPO on 13/02/2023.</li> <li>➢ Reply of RTI sent via Speed Post returned as "undelivered" on 27.03.2023 with remarks as "प्राप्तकर्ता की कोई जानकारी नहीं मिल रही I H. No. कच्ची कॉलोनी के कारण नहीं मिल रहा। २३/०३/२०२३."</li> </ul>
5.	ITPO/RTI/02/05/2023 Sh. Surinder Singh, New Delhi		<ul> <li></li></ul>

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	,

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:- <ul> <li>The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated.</li> <li>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of. A copy of this</li> </ul>
			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:

Sl. No	ID No.	Ground of Appeal	Decision of First Appellate Authority/remarks		
		APRIL 2024			
1		NII			
	<u>MAY 2024</u>				
1.	ITPO/RTI/A/04/01&04/202 4				
	Mr. Shah Nawaj Khan, New Delhi				
			<u> </u>		
			8 (1) (0) :- 0000000000000000000000000000000000		
			<pre></pre>		
			<ul> <li>&lt; □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□</li></ul>		
			<pre></pre>		
			<i>आपकी दोनो</i> ००० <i>लो</i> ०० ०००००० ०००० ०००		
2.	ITPO/RTI/A/05/01/2024 Mr. Shubham Jain,	<ul> <li>Provided Incomplete, Misleading or False Information</li> <li>Have not provided the information</li> </ul>	The RTI application & appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully		

	Tamilnadu	sought in the RTI.	and the following order is passed:-
			<ul> <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>
			<i>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</i>
3.	ITPO/RTI/A/04/02/2024	The Applicant/Appellant, being not satisfied with the information provided	<i>The RTI application &amp; appeal of the appellant and the information</i>
	Mr. Balram Jaiswal, Delhi	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	furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:- Information, as available and existing has been
		Appeal dated 21.05.2024 before the FAA stating:- 1. Has ITPO displayed the salaries	already provided to the applicant in reply to his RTI Application dated. 20.04.2024 vide PIO, ITPO letter dated. 13.05.2024.
		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.	<ul> <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</li> </ul>
		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.	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).
		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	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.
		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.	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
		<ul> <li>4. Please provide copy of approval of competent authority to appoint advisor on nomination basis.</li> <li>5. List. of Vandors angaged in</li> </ul>	fresh RTI. In this connection, kindly refer to the Central Information Commission, is decision
		5. List of Vendors engaged in providing Logistical support at ITPO like tentage, luminaries, stage, backdrops, flower decoration ate in part 03 wars	No.CIC/AB/A/2016/000004 dated 22.08.2017.
		<ul><li>decoration etc. in past 03 years and the payment made to them.</li><li>6. Provide me list of content</li></ul>	<ul> <li>According to RTI Act. u/s 19(6) it is mandatory to dispose off of appeal within 30 days, but the appeal is</li> </ul>
		appointed by ITPO on nomination basis in past ten years and expenditure incurred (CTC) on them each year. If the information	being disposed of after 30 days as the First Appellate Authority was on leave.

		is voluminous and large in number I may kindly be given the opportunity to inspect the document in person.	With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.
		JUNE 2024	
1	ITPO/RTI/A/05/10/2024 Mr. Siddharth Gupta, N.D	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.	<ul> <li>The RTI application &amp; appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</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>
2	ITPO/RTI/A/05/03/2024 Smt. Durgesh Nandni, SM, ITPO, New Delhi	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.	<ul> <li>appeal stands disposed of.</li> <li>The RTI application &amp; appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-</li> <li>The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>The outcome report of Beauty World Middle East, 2023 password of DOC</li> </ul>

<ul> <li>b. user nome:</li> <li>e. difficult discours in parsword: 53385.</li> <li>f) Information as existing and available already provided. The applicant, in the applicant, in the applicant, in the applicant is as exems to sought a dilutional information the inspection of the for the instance in the applicant is a sequence of the instance intervention of the for an intervention of the for state 2020.</li> <li>In the original RTT, the applicant is and asought details of the candidates (pars experience, qualifications), which is 3-dilutional to improve the inspection of the inspect</li></ul>	 1	
<ul> <li>password: 383855.</li> <li>Information as existing and available already provided. The applicant, in the applicant, but the applicant, in the applicant is additional information. I.e. trapection of file for furnishing reports to CVC, guidelines received in TPO state 2020.</li> <li>In the original RII, the candidates (past experience, qualifications), which is 3rd party information. For the remaining information, reference to TIPO wetter and optimation. For the remaining information, reference to TIPO wetter and optimation of the applicant.</li> <li>The information/document sough by you regarding, matter of complaint of Mrs. Amagaal Dixid against Garari Shanker is personal information of interpersion of the applicant.</li> <li>The information/document sough by you regarding, matter of complaint of the applicant.</li> <li>The information/document sough by you regarding, matter of complaint of the applicant.</li> <li>The information/document sough by solve active you are applied on the applicant.</li> <li>The information (applied on the applicant) of the applicant.</li> <li>The information (applied on the applicant) or interest, or which would cause unvarranted involves and applied on the privacy of an individual, qualifies for protection from disclosure us (SU(1)) of the RTI Act. 2005.</li> <li>The name of Mr. Statige was a part of the team of Foreign huper mobilization in Adhar 2022.</li> <li>The query in the original RII had no motion of the draviant as 26 Sept - 10 June 2022 (in respect to a disclosure us as 26 Sept - 10 June 2022 (in respect to a disclosure of a disting in place and of the applicant in the disclosure of a disting in the draviant of the applicant in the apped has now specified the draviant as 26 Sept - 10 June 2022 (in respect of a dution in Adhar 2022.</li> <li>The query in the complicant of the draviant as 26 Sept - 10 June 2022 (in respect of a dution in the duration as 26 Sept - 10 June 2022 (in respect of Adhini in the applicant in the applicant in the duratin as 26 Sept - 10 Jun</li></ul>		
<ul> <li>information as extrained and available already provided. The applicant, in her appeal, has seems to sought a difformation it. Suspection of file for furnishing reports to CVC guidelness received in IIPO since 2020.</li> <li>In the original RT1, the applicant had songith details of the condidates (past experience, qualifications), which is 3° and pure information. For the remating biformation, reference to TIPO website and option to import information. For the remating biformation, reference to TIPO website and option to import records had already been given to the applicant information of third party, disclosure of which have negative to the applicant in or the process of the remating biformation document sought by our regarding, matter of complaint of Mrs. Maragai Dixti against Gauri Shankar is personal information document sought by our regarding.</li> <li>The information/document sought by our regarding to any public activity or interest, or which would cause unwarranted invision of the privacy of an individual, qualifies for protection from disclosure and any public activity or interest. Series Survival end of Shi Youndey, Manager was a part of the cargot final cause of Shi Youndey, Manager Shi Yandey, Manager Shi Yandey,</li></ul>		
<ul> <li>and available already provided The applicant, is the append, has seems to sough additional highmation i.e. inspection of file for furtishing reports to CFC, guidelines received in TPO 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 highmation, reference to 11PO website and option to imspect records had already been gypen to the applicant.</li> <li>The highmation/acument sough by you regarding, matter of complaint of Mrs. Amapall Dixin against Camir Sharkar is personal information of third party, disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest, or which would cause unwarranted invession of the privacy of an individual, qualifies for protection from disclosure uts \$(1)(d) of the RTI Act, 2005.</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sanjay Vashish, Manager was a part of the teram of Foreign bayer mobilization in adhar 2022.</li> <li>The query in the original RTI had no moniton of the adhar 2022.</li> <li>The query in the original RTI had no moniton of the dividual was songth. The applicant, was a 26 Sept - 10 June 2022 (in respected the dividual in the application of Adhar 2022.</li> <li>The query in the original RTI had no moniton of the dividual on the application of the dividual on the adhar and the application in the application of Adhar 2022.</li> <li>The query in the original RTI had no moniton of the dividual of Adhar 2022.</li> <li>The query of adhar in the application of Adhar 2022.</li> <li>The query of adhar in the append has now specified the dividual addition of the Competent Atholority was conveyed to her vide and divide 7.05.2024. The information provided by 'iglance regarding her complicant has already by Completion the adhard of the completent has already by Calmar application provided and the addition provided andition</li></ul>		
<ul> <li>provided. The applicant, in her append. has seens to sought additional information it. Inspection of file for furnishing reports to CCC guidelines received in TFPO since 2020.</li> <li>In the original RT1, the applicant had sought details of the conditates (nust experience, quilifications), which is 37 dr party information. For the remaining information, reference to 11PO website and option to impect record had adready been given to the applicant set. Sought by you regording, making of compliant of the set of the provided of the set of</li></ul>		
<ul> <li>in her apped, 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 sanght details of the candidates (past experience, qualifications), which is 3rd party information. For the remaining information reference to TIPO website and option in inspect received had already been given to the applicant.</li> <li>The information/document sought of the remaining information reference to TIPO website and option in inspect receives had already been given to the applicant of the remaining information reference to TIPO website and option in inspect receives had already been given to the applicant.</li> <li>The information/document sought by our regarding, matter of complaint of Mirs Amapal Dixti agains Gauri Shankar is personal information of the party, disclosure of which has no relationships.</li> <li>The nume of Mr. Sunjay Fashish, Manager Shri Vaside, Manager was sought The applicant in place of Shri Vasider, Manager Shri Vasider, Manager was an or specified he duration as 20 Sept - 10 Jane 2024 (in respect of Advin Instrument of the applicant in the applead has now specified he duration as 20 Sept - 10 Jane 2024 (in respect of Advin, Drivish). In reference to Status of action taket by Administration Drivision on her representation reguring Advisory duel 2009.2023. The function for Adving the duration as 20 Sept - 10 Jane 2024 (in respect of Advin, Drivish). In reference to Status of a duration for which duration for which duration for which duration as 20 Sept - 10 Jane 2024 (in respect of Advin, Drivish). In reference to Status of action taket by Administration Drivish on the applicant in the applead has now specified he duration as 20 Sept - 10 Jane 2024 (in respect of Advin, Drivish). In reference to Status of action taket by Administration Drivish on the amagement and the duration as 20 Sept - 10</li></ul>		
<ul> <li>sough<sup>1</sup> additional information i.c. inspection of file for furnishing reports to CC guidelines received in ITPO since 2020.</li> <li>In the original RT1, the applicant had songhit details of the conditates (trust experience, qualifications), which is 37 d party information. For the remaining information, reference to 17PO vebsite and applicant to inspect records had already been given to the applicant.</li> <li>The information document sought by your regarding, matter of complaint of Mr5, drargald. Data guinst Gauri Sharakar is personal information of third party, disclosure of third party, disclosure of which has no relationship to any public using of the endediction of the provide the information of monosciptic provide the information of the art standar is personal information of monosciptic persons in the applicant.</li> <li>The information of the privacy of an inforvibule, qualifies for protection from disclosure us \$ (1010) driver RT and the standard in the information of monosciptic persons in the antipolication in Advance is septiment on the privacy of an inforvibule, qualifies for protection from disclosure us \$ (1010) drivers, for which wrand crusses unveraring in the applicant in the activity of the RT1 Act, 2005.</li> <li>The name of Mr. Stanjay Vasitish, Manager was a part of the duration for which status was songhit, the applicant in the append has now specified the duration as 20 Sept - 10 June 2011 (in respect of Adviton) was conveyed to her rote 2009, 2013, the decision on here representation programing Advisory duel 20.09.2013, the decision on here appresent has a heread 20.09.2013, the decision on here compleant has already by Tigliance regarding her compleant has already</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>information 1.e. inspection of file for furnishing reports to CIC, guidelines received in ITPO since 2020.</li> <li>In the original RTI, the applicant had sought details of the conditions of the reading of the conditions of the result of the conditions of the result of the</li></ul>		
<ul> <li>reports to CVC, guidelines received in ITPO since 2020.</li> <li>In the original RTI, the applicant had sought details of the candidates (post 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/accounters sought by you regarding, matter of complaint of Mrs. Ammpatil Data applicant.</li> <li>The information/accounters sought by you regarding.</li> <li>matter of complaint of Mrs. Ammpatil Data applicant.</li> <li>The information/accounters or you public activity or interest. or which would cause unwarranted invasion of the RTI Act, 2005.</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sanjay Vashisth. Manager was aport of the team of Nor Sanjay Vashisth. Manager was aport of the team of Versign by per- mobilication in Alabar 2022.</li> <li>The query in the original RTI had no mention of the duration for which status was songht. The appleat has now specified the duration as 26 Sept - 10 June 2024 (in respect of Admin. Division). In reference to Status of action for the duration or which status was songht. The appleat in her appeal has now specified the duration of the duration or status was songht. The appleant in her appeal has now specified the duration of the duration or status was songht. The appleant in her appeal has now specified the duration or the representation regarding Athsory duced 20.09.203, the decision of the Competent Julionity was conveyed to her wide email dared 27.02.02.</li> </ul>		•
<ul> <li>received in ITPO since 2020.</li> <li>In the original RLI the applicant hod sought details of the conditions (which is 3rd part) information. (For the remaining information, reference to ITPO vebsite 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. Anrapali Dixit against Gauri Shankar is personal information in the present of Mathematican information in the present of Mathematicant information informa</li></ul>		
<ul> <li>2020.</li> <li>In the original RTI, the applicant had sought details of the candidates (pust experience, qualifications), which is 3rd party information, reference to 17170 website and option to inspect records had already been given to the applicant.</li> <li>The information/content is a straight of the sought of</li></ul>		
<ul> <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 TIPO website and option to inspect records had abready been given to the applicant.</li> <li>The information/document sought by you regarding, matter of complaint of Mrs. Amrapol Disting of the applicant of the party information of the party discusse of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest, or which would cause unwarmed invasion of the privacy of an individual, qualifies for protection from discloser of which has no relationship methods of the transmer with \$(1)(i) of the RTI Act, 2005.</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sanjay Fashisth, Manager was a part of the team of Foreign bary and the duration for which status was sought. The applicant in Advar 2022.</li> <li>The query in the original RTI had no mention of the duration for which status was sought. The applicant in the fame of action also a 26 Sept - 10 June 2024 (in respect of Mathin Drivision). In reference to Status of action taken by Administration Drivison of the regreser of the team of a duration as 26 Sept - 10 June 2024. The duration as 26 Sept - 10 June 2024. The duration as 26 Sept - 10 June 2024. The duration as 26 Sept - 10 June 2024. The duration as 26 Sept - 10 June 2024. The information provided by Vigiliance regrammentation provided by Vigiliance regarding and the early of the completion that and the duration of the duration of the duration for which status was sought. The appeal has now specified the duration as 26 Sept - 10 June 2024 (in respect of the vide early appeal and the regression of the completion the advarded by Vigiliance regarding the completion the advarded by Vigiliance regareading pertended by Vigiliance regarding the completion tas</li></ul>		
<ul> <li>applicant had sought details of the candidates (past experience, qualifications), which is 3rd party information. For the remaining information, reference to TTPO 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. Anrangal Dixit against Gauri Shankar is personal information of the transmitter of complaint of the information document sought by you regarding, matter of complaint of the information of the privacy of an individual qualifies for protection from disclosure unwarranted invasion of the RTI Act. 2005.</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sanaya (Mr. Sanaya Vasala).</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sanaya Vasala (Mr. Sanaya Vasala).</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sanaya Vasala (Mr. Sanaya Vasala).</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sanaya Vasala (Mr. Sanaya Vasala).</li> <li>The name of foreign buyer mobilization in Adher 2022.</li> <li>The query in the original RTI had no mention of the duration for the duration of the duration of a during the same specified the duration of a during the same specified the duration of the d</li></ul>		
<ul> <li>details of the candidates (past) experience. qualifications), which its 3rd party information. For the remaining information, reference to TIPPO website and option to inspect represents had already been given to the applicant.</li> <li>The information/document sought by your regarding, matter of compatint of Mrs. Amropatil Distit 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 quilifes for protection from disclosure u/s 8(1)(i) of the RTI Act, 2005.</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sanjay Vashish, Manager was any of the team of Forse ap and of the adaptication in alabar 2022.</li> <li>The query in the original RTI had no mention of the duration for which status was sought results. The adaptication in Alabar 2022.</li> <li>The query in the original RTI had no mention of the duration for which status was sought appeal has now specified the duration of the duration for the duration of the duration of the duration of the duration for which status was sought the applicant. The information provided by Figlioner engand matter and the duration provided by the duration in a lateady</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>(past experience, qualifications), which is 3rd party information. For the remaining information, reference to TTPO 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. Manapati Distin againstant 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 RTI Act. 2005.</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sangay Wang and Shangay Washish, Manager was inverdantly menioned in place of Shri Vasudev, Manager was a part of the tam of Foreign buyer mobilization in Alabra 2022.</li> <li>The query in the original RTI Had no mention of the duration for which status was sought. The applicant in Britemation and the application in Alabra 2022.</li> <li>The query in the original RTI had no mention of the duration for which status was sought. The applicant in Britemation and the application in Alabra 2022.</li> <li>The query in the original RTI had no mention of the duration for which status was competed to the vide email dated 21.09.2023, the decision of the duration provided by Viguinner engaing. Advisory dated 20.09.2023, the decision of the competiant has a laready the complaint has a laready the complaint has a laready the status of action taken by viguinner engaing divisory dated 20.09.2023.</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>qualifications), which is 3rd party information. For the remaining information reference to TIPD website and option to inspect records had already been given to the applicant.</li> <li>The information regarding, matter of complaint of Mrs. Anropali 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 AT Act, 2005.</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sanjay Vashish, Manager was invertantly maintee of complexity vashish, Manager was invertantly in privacy of an individual, qualifies for protection from disclosure of Xashish, Manager was invertantly invertantly in any public and the Xashish is the Activity of the AT Act, 2005.</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sanjay Vashish, Manager was invertantly mentioned in place of Shri Vasudev. Manager was a part of the team of Foreign bayer mobilization in Adhar 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 representiation of the duration provided by Vigulance regarding her complaint has already</li> </ul>		·
<ul> <li>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 agatnst Gaura Shankars 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 with 8(1)(i) of the RTI Act, 2005.</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sanjay Yaahish Manager was invertiantly mentioned in place of Shri Vasudev, Manager was part of the team of Foreign hyper mobilization in Aahar 2022.</li> <li>The query in the original RTI had no mention of the duration for which statution and apple las now specified the duration as 20 Sept - 10 June 2024, the applecant in the regpendition of the Division). In reference to Status of action taken by Administration Division on her representation of the complaint has already</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>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. Ammapali Disting of Mrs. Ammapali Disting to any public activity or interest, or which would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual, qualifies for protection from disclosure us 8(1)(1) of the RTI Act, 2005.</li> <li>The ane of Mr. Sanjay Veshish, Manager was apart 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 applecant in her appeal has now specified the duration as already</li> </ul>		· · ·
<ul> <li>ITPO websie and option to inspect records had adready been given to the applicant.</li> <li>The information/document sought by you regarding, matter of complaint of Mrs. Amrapali Dixit against Garni Shankar is personal information of thrid 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)(i) of the RTI Act, 2005.</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sanjay Vashisth, Manager was inverdantly mentioned in place of Shri Vasudey, Manager, Or Vashisth, The applicant in place of Shri Vasudey, Manager, 10 June 2021.</li> <li>The query in the original RTI had no mention of the As now specified the duration for which status was sogetified the duration in cubic base so the division on her representation regarding. Additional points of the Competent Authority was competed to her vide email dated 27.05.2024. The information provided by Vigillance regarding Advisory dated 27.05.2024.</li> </ul>		0
<ul> <li>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 pary, 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 of the second disclosure u/s 8(1)(0) of the RTI Act. 2005.</li> <li>The anger Mission and Mis</li></ul>		• •
<ul> <li>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 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 unvaranted invasion of the privacy of an individual qualifies for protection from disclosure u/s 8(1)(i) of the RTI Act, 2005.</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sanjay Vashish, Manager was in place of Shri Vasudev, Manager so a part of the team of Foreign buyer mobilization in Ashar 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 on her representation regarding Advisory dated 20.09.203, the decision of presentation as all divisory dated 20.09.203, the decision of privation provided by Figurace regarding Her complaint has already</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>applicant.</li> <li>The information/documents sought by you regarding, matter of complaint of Mrs. Amrapal 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 Vashish, Manager was invertantly mentioned in place of Shri Vasudev, Manager Shri Vasudev, Manaker Shri Shri Shri Shri Shri Shri Shri Shr</li></ul>		-
<ul> <li>The information/document sought by you regarding, matter of complaint of Mrs. Amrapali Disti 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 an individual, qualifies for protection from disclosure us \$(1/1) of the RI1 Act. 2003.</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sanjay</li> <li>Vashisth, Manager was in place of Shri Vasudev, Manager. Shri Vasudev, Manager was a part of the team of Foreign bayer mobilization in Anhar 2022.</li> <li>The query in the original RTI had no relations as 26 Sept - 10 June 2004 (in respect of Admin. Division). In reference to Status of action taken by Administration Division on here regrestion on here regrestion on compatint has already was a compating Advisory dated 20.09.203, the desired and dated 20.023.</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>sought by you regarding, matter of complaint of Mrs. Anrapali Dixti 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)(i) of the RTI Act, 2005.</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sanjay Vashish, Manager was inverted to a standard disclosure of Shri Vasudev, Manager. Shri Vasudev, Manager. Shri Vasudev, Manager. Shri Vasudev, Manager was a part of the team of Foreign buyer mobilization in Aahar 2022.</li> <li>The application of the application as 26 Sept - 10 June 2024 (in respect of Admin. Division). In reference to Status of action taken by Administration Division on her representation on of the representation of the completent Authority was conveyed to her vide email dated 20.09.203, the decision of the Completent Authority was comyled to her vide email dated 21.05.204. The information provided by Vigilance regarding her complaint has already</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>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 unwaronted 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 Vashish, Manager was inverdantly mentioned in place of Shri Vasudev, Manager. Shri Vasudev, Manager and Foreign buyer mobilization in Anhar 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 provided 20.09.2033, the decision of the Competent Authority was conveyed to her vide email dated 27.05.2024. The information provided by Vigilance regarding Advisory dated by Vigilance regarding heredy</li> </ul>		-
<ul> <li>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 &amp;(1)(i) of the RTI Act, 2005.</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sanjay Vashish, Manager vas invertantly 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 20.09.2032, 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</li> </ul>		· · ·
<ul> <li>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(1/0) of the RTI Act, 2005.</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sanjay Vashish, Manager was inverted with mentioned in place of Shri Vasudev, Manager was 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 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 20.00.203, the decision of the Competent Authority was conveyed to her vide</li> </ul>		1
<ul> <li>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(1/0) of the RTI Act, 2005.</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sanjay Vashisth, Manager was inverdantly mentioned in place of Shri Vasudev, Manager was a part of the team of Foreign bayer mobilization in Adhar 2022.</li> <li>The query in the original RTI had no mention of the duration for which status was sought. The 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 Tormy and the duration provided by Vigilance regarding her complaint has a aready</li> </ul>		•
<ul> <li>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)(i) 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. 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 expect 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</li> </ul>	-	
<ul> <li>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 inverdantly mentioned in place of Shri Vasudev, Manager. Shri Vasudev, Manager. 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</li> </ul>		· · ·
<ul> <li>interest, or which would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual, qualifies for protection from disclosure us's 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005.</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sanjay Vashisth, Manager was inverdantly mentioned in place of Shri Vasudev, Manager was a part of the team of Foreign buyer mobilization in Adhar 2022.</li> <li>The query in the original RTI had no mention of the duration for which status was sought. The 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</li> </ul>		- -
<ul> <li>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 Vashish, 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 and the applicant in her appeal has now specified the duration 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</li> </ul>		
an individual, qualifies for protection from disclosure u/s 8(1)(i) of the RTI Act, 2005. The name of Mr. Sanjay Vashish, Manager was in- verdantly mentioned in place of Shri Vasudev, Manager sa part of the team of Foreign buyer mobilization in Aahar 2022. 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		
<ul> <li>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.</li></ul>		invasion of the privacy of
<ul> <li>u's 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005.</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sanjay Vashisth, Manager was inverdantly mentioned in place of Shri Vasudev, Manager. Shri Vasudev, Manager was a part of the team of Foreign buyer mobilization in Adhar 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</li> </ul>		· · ·
<ul> <li>2005.</li> <li>The name of Mr. Sanjay Vashisth, Manager was inverdantly 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</li> </ul>	-	- ·
<ul> <li>The name of Mr. Sanjay Vashish, 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</li> </ul>		
Vashisth, Manager was inverdantly mentioned in place of Shri Vasudev, Manager. Shri Vasudev, Manager. Shri Vasudev, Manager. Shri Vasudev, Manager was a part of the team of Foreign buyer mobilization in Aahar 2022.         ◆ 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		
<ul> <li>verdantly mentioned in place of Shri Vasudev, Manager 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</li> </ul>		
Manager. Shri Vasudev, Manager was a part of the team of Foreign buyer mobilization in Aahar 2022.         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		-
Manager was a part of the team of Foreign buyer mobilization in Aahar 2022.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		place of Shri Vasudev,
team of Foreign buyer mobilization in Aahar 2022. 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		e
<ul> <li>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 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</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>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</li> </ul>		
<ul> <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</li> </ul>		
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		
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		
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		÷
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		
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		~ ~
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		* *
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		-
Status of action taken by Administration Division on herrepresentation 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		÷ •
Administration Division on herrepresentation 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		
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		
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		
of the Competent Authority was conveyed to her vide email dated 27.05.2024. The information provided by Vigilance regarding her complaint has already		
was conveyed to her vide email dated 27.05.2024. The information provided by Vigilance regarding her complaint has already		
email dated 27.05.2024. The information provided by Vigilance regarding her complaint has already		
The information provided by Vigilance regarding her complaint has already		
by Vigilance regarding her complaint has already		
complaint has already		v 1

			omail dated 12 05 2021
			<ul> <li>email dated. 13.05.2024.</li> <li>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 came forward to collect the documents.</li> <li>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 <u>26<sup>th</sup> July, 2024 (During office hours)</u>. 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 at the given date and time situated at Room No. 15, 4<sup>th</sup> floor, New Admin. Building, Pragati Maidan, New Delhi – 110001. 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> </ul>
3.	ITPO/RTI/A/05/03/2024 Sh. Pankaj, SM,ITPO	The applicant being unsatisfied with the decision of PIO, ITPO has submitted first Appeal before the First Appellate Authority, ITPO stating that:-	The RTI application & appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-
		<ul> <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>	<ul> <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>

Sl. No	ID No.	Ground of Appeal	Decision of First Appellate Authority/remarks
		July' 2024	1
1		NIL	
		August 2024	
	ITPO/RTI/A/07/03&04/2024 Sh. Shah Nawaj Khan, Delhi	August 2024	

1.         ITPO/RTF/A/08/06/2024         000000000000000000000000000000000000		<u>September, 2024</u>	<pre></pre>
	1.		$\begin{array}{c} 3 \tau \cdot \hat{\tau} \\ \hat{\tau} \\ \vdots \\ $

2	ITPO/RTI/A/08/09/2024 Mr. Kuldeep, New Delhi ITPO/RTI/A/09/08/2024	The applicant had filled RTI Applications No. Nil Dated. 14/08/2024 seeking information pertaining to various points for Re-development of ITPO Complex into Integrated Exhibition-Cum- Convention Centre (IECC) at Pragati Maidan, New Delhi on Design, Engineering, Procurement and Construction (EPC) basis including operation & Maintenance by ITPO. The applicant has informed that I found no reply within thirty days of the receipt of the request whether it has been accepted or rejected under Sections 8 and 9 and RTI Act 2005.	Please find enclosed 1 <sup>st</sup> Appeal dated. 20 <sup>th</sup> September, 2024 received from Shri Kuldeep of Delhi seeking information on Re- development of ITPO Complex into Integrated Exhibition-Cum- Convention Centre (IECC) at Pragati Maidan, New Delhi on Design, Engineering, Procurement and Construction (EPC) basis including operation & Maintenance" by India Trade Promotion Organisation (ITPO). The RTI dated 14.08.2024 received from the applicant were transferred to NBCC vide ITPO's letter No. ITPO/RTI/08/09/2024 dated. 22.08.2024 as per provision u/s 6(3) of the RTI Act, 2005. The applicant has now informed that no reply is received within thirty days of the receipt of the request. It is therefore requested necessary action may be taken, by FAA, NBCC, as per provision u/s 6(3) of the RTI Act, 2005, directly to the applicant, under intimation to ITPO.

Sh. Pankaj, SM, ITPO	the decision of PIO, ITPO has submitted first Appeal before the First Appellate Authority, ITPO stating that:-	appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-
	<ul> <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>	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 & 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.
		<u> </u> ]