

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

			<p><i>subject will be entertained by ITPO.</i></p> <p><i>With these remarks, the appeal stands rejected.</i></p>
3	ITPO/RTI/Appeal/02/05/2021 Sh. K.P.S. Yadav, Ghaziabad	<p>The appellant was not satisfied with the reply and filed the appeal after lapsing of more than 04 months on July 28, 2021 as against the 30 days time limit prescribed under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act 2005.</p> <p>The appeal has been filed on the pretext that Shri Manish Yadav, has falsely acquired the OBC NCL certificate despite being in creamy layer. In order to dig out corruption and being transparency in governance, OBC Certificate may be provided under RTI.</p>	<p>After having perused the RTI application, reply furnished by PIO, and reasons raised in your 1st Appeal, it is reiterated that information sought by you is a third party information and qualified for protection from disclosure under Section 8(1)0) as already conveyed to you by CPIO/PIO via letter dated 08.03.2021.</p> <p>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</p>
4	ITPO/RTI/Appeal/09/03/2021 Sh. Harinarayan Pathak, Guwahati	<p>➤ <i>The appellant stated that CPIO has forwarded the reply without any DOCUMENTARY PROOFS / RECORDS, and on perusal, found unsatisfactory, leading to this FIRST APPEAL PETITION u/s. 19(1) of RTI Act, 2005, on following facts:</i></p> <p>➤ <i>That CPIO, ITPO, though her reply had admitted that "The ITPO has given the work to CPWD on deposit basis. CPWD had executed the work starting from taking all statutory approval and handing over after completion".</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">-2-</p> <p>➤ <i>Through the aforesaid decision/reply, CPIO had admitted that the ITPO. have in possession of all relevant Documentary Proofs/records, except , N.O.C. issued from G.M.D.A. or G.M.C.. in respect of Constructions of M.D. T.C., a Unit of A.T.P.O, Guwahati from beginning till handover from CPWD.</i></p> <p>➤ <i>But, unfortunately, CPIO, ITPO, New Delhi, inadvertently, could not furnishing such</i></p>	<p><i>The RTI application & appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">❖ <i>"There is no record available with us, since the work was done by CPWD, we have requested CPWD to provide information directly to the applicant".</i></p> <p><i>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</i></p>

		<p><i>Documentary Proofs/Records, held by ITPO, New Delhi.</i></p> <p>➤ <i>THAT Letter under reference against point no. 2 of my application the SPIO, ATPO in his reply stated that the Dept. of Commerce, GOI in association with ITPO, New Delhi developed the project through CPWD. As such, all the relevant documentary proofs/records in respect of construction of MDTC are held by ITPO, New Delhi except NOC from GMDA/GMC.</i></p>	
5	ITPO/RTI/Appeal/09/10/2021 Sh. Rohit Sonkar, Delhi	<p><i>The appellant not satisfied with the reply of point no. 2, filed First Appeal dated 16.11.2021 before the First Appellate Authority, ITPO stating that:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. The information is being denied on the pretext that it deals with ongoing disciplinary proceedings (nature of investigation, Sec 8(1)(h) of RTI Act 2005) and it hampers the discretion of the Inquiry Officer to decide as to what documents the officer proceeded against will have access to.</i> <i>2. Secondly, CIC ruling whose reference is quoted unequivocally.</i> 	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>Being satisfied with the facts brought to the notice, the information sought vide point no.2 cannot be disclosed being covered u/s 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act 2005.</i></p> <p><i>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed off.</i></p>

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

Sl. No.	ID No.	Ground of Appeal	Decision of First Appellate Authority/remarks
1.	ITPO/RTI/A/12/03&10/2021 Shri. Rohit Sonkar, Delhi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 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.. ➤ 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 ➤ It is pertinent to mention here that information that a public body has access to is deemed information under Section 2(f) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 as per para 8 of the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the matter of Poorna Prajna High School V/s. Central Information Commission. ➤ 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. ➤ Furthermore, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Khanapuram Gandaiah Vs. Administrative Officer & Ors. Decided on 04.01.2009, held that: <p>“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.”</p> <p>This definition shows that an applicant under section 6 of the RTI Act can get any information which is already in existence and accessible to the public authority under law. Of course, under the RTI Act an applicant is entitled to get copy of the opinions, advices, circulars, orders, etc., but he cannot ask for any information as to why such opinions, advices, circulars, orders, etc. have been passed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The information sought by the applicant is of nature of query. ❖ Kind attention is invited at Section 2(f) of RTI Act defining “information” as under:- “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;” ❖ The applicant is well aware of the facts of his arrest and subsequent suspension. ❖ 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.
2.	ITPO/RTI/A/01/06/2022 Sh. R.K. Suneja, N.D	<p>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.</p> <p>My questions were – 1. Is there any rule regarding the refund of payment made for booking stalls in the fairs organized</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Q.2 During last 3 years</p>

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

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

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

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

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

		<p>mechanical way without going in detail with what information had been sought for under the ambit of RTI act.</p>	<p>applicant. As regards names of the Committee Members, the same may not be considered under Section 8(1)(g) of the RTI Act. Section 8(1)(g) of the RTI Act exempts the disclosure of “information”, the disclosure of which would endanger the life or physical, safety of any person or identify the source of information or assistance given in confidence for law enforcement or security purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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.
8	<p>ITPO/RTI/A/01/08/2022</p> <p>Sh. Akshay, New Delhi</p>	<p>The Appellant being not contented with the information provided by PIO, filed 1st Appeal(s) before the FAA, ITPO stating that PIO denied the information on baseless and flimsy grounds in a mechanical way without going in detail with what information had been sought for under the ambit of RTI act.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reply provided under RTI is reiterated. <p>The composition of the Review Committees were already provided to the applicant. As regards names of the Committee Members, the same may not be considered under Section 8(1)(g) of the RTI Act. Section 8(1)(g) of the RTI Act exempts the disclosure of “information”,</p>

			<p>the disclosure of which would endanger the life or physical, safety of any person or identify the source of information or assistance given in confidence for law enforcement or security purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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.
9	ITPO/RTI/A/02/11/2022 Sh. Ashok Kumar, SM, ITPO	The Appellant being not contented with the information provided by PIO, filed 1st Appeal(s) before the FAA, ITPO stating that PIO deliberately concealed the vital information and requisite documents and have not provided the required information and documents and deliberately denied the requisite information or knowingly provided the incomplete, incorrect or misleading information.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The allegation of the applicant against the Public Authority is baseless. Information as existing and available and furnished by the concerned unit/division was provided to the applicant. Public Authorities cannot invent information as per the whims of the applicant. • The reply provided in

			<p>respect of the RTI has been reiterated. The orders dated 08.09.2021 and 13.09.2021 were issued at HoD level and not processed in the relevant file maintained in the Section. An inspection of the file was also carried out by the applicant on 25.03.2022.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.• With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of. A copy of this decision be sent to the appellant and CPIO, ITPO.
--	--	--	---

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

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

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

	Jayanta Kumar Das, Orisa	<p>ITPOR/R/E/22/00030 dated. 22/04/2022 received online seeking information does not pertain to ITPO and instead it pertains to DPIIT, Ministry of Commerce & Industries, New Delhi. The RTI had been transferred to DPIIT dated. 26/04/2022.</p> <p>We have received 1st Appeal Application vide Registration No. ITPOR/A/E/22/00009 dated 23rd May, 2022 received on ITPO Portal on 24.05.2022 from Shri Jayanta Kumar Das, Styra Nagar, Sida Mahabir Patana, Puri-752002 (Odisha). A copy of the 1st Appeal Application received is attached for your reference.</p>	said 1 st 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 1 st Appeal(s) before the FAA, ITPO stating that PIO deliberately concealed the vital information and requisite documents and have not provided the required information and documents and deliberately denied the requisite information or knowingly provided the incomplete, incorrect or misleading information.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated. • 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. • It is again reiterated that no such feedback/reports/comments are available in Admin. regarding transfer of applicant. • 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. • With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of. A copy of this decision be sent to the appellant and CPIO, ITPO.

5.	<p>ITPO/RTI/04/07/2022</p> <p>Ashok Kumar, New Delhi</p>	<p>The Appellant being not contented with the information provided by CPIO, filed 1st Appeal(s) before the FAA, ITPO stating that PIO deliberately concealed the vital information and requisite documents and have not provided the required information and documents and deliberately denied the requisite information or knowingly provided the incomplete, incorrect or misleading information.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated. • An interim reply was provided to the applicant vide PIO reply dated 13.05.2022 since the information sought by the applicant was to be provided by various Divisions. Moreover, all were busy in pre-fair activities in organising AAHAR 2022 which was to be opened on April 26, 2022. • With regard to unanswered/remaining 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 facie 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 facie 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
----	--	--	---

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

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

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

		criminal offences in PSU / PSB & hence exposing them involve larger public interest.	
3.	ITPO/RTI/08/03&04/2022 Shri. Kuldeep New Delhi	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 applicant has now informed that no reply is received within thirty days of the receipt of the request.	The RTIs dated 29 th July 2022 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. 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	➤ No response has been given by the authority with respect to the current RTI nor any kind of objection have been raised. ➤ PIO did not send reply.	➤ 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. ➤ Reply of RTI sent via Speed Post returned as "undelivered" on 27.03.2023 with remarks as "प्राप्तकर्ता की कोई जानकारी नहीं मिल रही। H. No. कच्ची कॉलोनी के कारण नहीं मिल रहा। २३/०३/२०२३."
5.	ITPO/RTI/02/05/2023 Sh. Surinder Singh, New Delhi	राष्ट्रिय प्रतियोगिता में भाग लेने वाले खिलाड़ियों को सुरक्षा सुनिश्चित करने हेतु आवश्यक पर्यवेक्षण और निगरानी का अभाव है। वर्ष 2005 से पहले ही 19 वीं शताब्दी के दौरान भारत सरकार द्वारा जारी किए गए अधिनियमों/ नियमों के तहत सुरक्षा व्यवस्थाओं को लागू किया जा चुका है। इन सभी बातों को ध्यान में रखते हुए भी अभी तक पर्याप्त सुरक्षा उपायों को अपनाया नहीं गया है। इससे न केवल खेलकूद क्षेत्र में भ्रष्टाचार फैल सकता है बल्कि देश की प्रतिष्ठा भी खतरनाक हो सकती है।	➤ राष्ट्रिय प्रतियोगिता में भाग लेने वाले खिलाड़ियों को सुरक्षा सुनिश्चित करने हेतु आवश्यक पर्यवेक्षण और निगरानी का अभाव है। वर्ष 2005 से पहले ही 19 वीं शताब्दी के दौरान भारत सरकार द्वारा जारी किए गए अधिनियमों/ नियमों के तहत सुरक्षा व्यवस्थाओं को लागू किया जा चुका है। इन सभी बातों को ध्यान में रखते हुए भी अभी तक पर्याप्त सुरक्षा उपायों को अपनाया नहीं गया है। इससे न केवल खेलकूद क्षेत्र में भ्रष्टाचार फैल सकता है बल्कि देश की प्रतिष्ठा भी खतरनाक हो सकती है। ➤ राष्ट्रीय - 1, राज्य - 2 को सुरक्षा देना आवश्यक है। ➤ राष्ट्रीय - 1 को उपलब्ध रिकार्ड्स के अनुसार मांगी गई जानकारी को संपूर्ण रूप से (03 दिनों) सौंपना ! ➤ राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर सुरक्षा पर्यवेक्षण (Inspection) को शुरू करना चाहिए। विशेष रूप से दिल्ली में ! रक्षा विभाग को सूचित किया जा रहा है। (Inspection) शुरू करेंगे !

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[illegible]

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

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

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

			<p>email dated. 13.05.2024.</p> <p>❖ It is informed that the PIO, ITPO had replied to the applicant vide letter No. ITPO/RTI/05/03/2024 dated 07.06.2024 that the details of the requisite information (photocopy 08 pages) can be obtained from the RTI Cell, ITPO, by depositing Rs. 16/- towards photocopying charges. However, the applicant did not come forward to collect the documents.</p> <p>❖ In this context this is to inform that Shri Rajnesh Kumar Naudiyal, Deputy Manager, Admin. Division, (E-I), and Smt. Meena Dogra, Assistant Manager, FS-I Division, has been nominated to arrange inspection of the relevant file(s) by the applicant on <u>26th 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 & General Manager at the given date and time situated at Room No. 15, 4th 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.</p> <p>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</p>
3.	ITPO/RTI/A/05/03/2024 Sh. Pankaj, SM,ITPO	<p>The applicant being unsatisfied with the decision of PIO, ITPO has submitted first Appeal before the First Appellate Authority, ITPO stating that:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 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 ➤ As regards point no.3 the exact clause/page no. of ITPO service regulation available in the notification-knowledge 	<p>The RTI application & appeal of the appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated. ❖ 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

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

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

[illegible]

[illegible]

	Sh. Pankaj, SM, ITPO	<p><i>the decision of PIO, ITPO has submitted first Appeal before the First Appellate Authority, ITPO stating that:-</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 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. ➤ As per reply provided under point no.2 kindly provide the year as reply is incomplete without mentioning the year after 15th November.. ➤ 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. ➤ 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 & 2020-21 and not ACR. Please provide the copy of guidelines of APAR. ➤ As regard point no 5, the reply is in contradiction to reply given at point no 1. ➤ As regard point no 6 & 7, if possible, kindly arrange the inspection in the first week of October. 	<p><i>appellant and the information furnished by CPIO has been examined carefully and the following order is passed:-</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The reply provided in respect of the RTI has been reiterated. ❖ As regards point no.2 - No information available. ❖ As regards point no.3 - Seeking clarification is not covered under the ambit of "Information" as defined u/s 2(f) of the RTI Act 2005. ❖ As regards point no. 4 - APAR guidelines can be obtained from the SPARROW portal / available in hard copy of APAR format. ❖ In this context, this is to inform that Shri Praful. S. Nair, M (ACR Unit), ITPO, New Delhi and Shri Rajnesh Kumar Naudiyal, Deputy Manager, Admin. Division, (E-I), has been nominated to arrange inspection of the relevant file(s) by the applicant on <u>21st or 22nd October, 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. <i>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, 4th floor, New Admin. Building, Pragati Maidan, New Delhi – 110001.</i> 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. ❖ Copy of relevant documents (02 pages), as mentioned our letter dated. 25.09.2024 is enclosed. <p><i>With these remarks, the appeal stands disposed of.</i></p>
--	----------------------	---	---