BEFORE THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

(Under the Right to Information Act, 2005)

INDIA GOVERNMENT MINT

(A Unit of SPMCIL)

IDA.Phase.II, HCL Post, Cherlapally, Hyderabad – 500 051

First Appeal No. IGMHY/A/E/24/00001 dated 23.01.2024

Banit	:	Appellant
	Vs.	
CPIO(Tech), IGMH, Hyderabad	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant filed an application under RTI Act, 2005 which has been forwarded to the Public Authority Under Section 6(3) of the RTI Act, 2005 on January 23rd, 2024 under the Right to Information Act, 2005 ("**RTI Act**") through the RTI MIS Portal bearing Registration No: IGMHY/R/T/24/00006. The respondent disposed of the request vide his online reply dated January 24th, 2024 to the appellant. The appellant filed the present appeal dated January 24th, 2024 against the above response. I have carefully considered the application, the response and the Appeal and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record.

2. From the Appeal, I note that the appellant is aggrieved by the respondent's response to his application for not providing information as sought with respect to coins minted between 1935 to 2023.

Queries in the application:

Sl No.	Date of Application	Information sought
1	January 23rd, 2024	**1947 - 2023** के बीच जारी सिक्कों का विवरण

3. The respondent provided the information to the appellant well within the prescribed period of time as per the provisions contained in the RTI Act, 2005.

4. **Grounds in Appeal –** The applicant raised the appeal as below:

> *"*PROVIDE INCOMPLETE OR FALSE INFORMATION, PROVIDED URL LINK AND THEN OTHER LINK NOT OPEN AND USEFUL, PLZ GIVE INFORMATION BY POST AS PER REQUEST APPLICATION MENSION*."*

5. In this regard, the FAA observes that requisite information as is available with the public authority has already been uploaded in the Public Domain at the domain address,

https://igmhyderabad.spmcil.com/en/discover-spmcil/#rticomplaince/ (under RTI Compliance Tab). That apart the same has been communicated to the Appellant by the concerned CPIO on 24.01.2024. Under the provisions of the RTI Act, 2005 the CPIO is not required to compile the information he is only required to provide the information as is available with the public authority.

Since the information as available with the public authority has already been made available at the aforementioned domain under Pro-Active disclosure norms of the Act in terms of RTI Query replies to various applicants, the reply provided by the CPIO is in line with the provisions of the Act.

6. In furtherance of the provisions of the RTI Act, direct links for all such files are provided below for the sake of brevity containing relevant information as available:

2020: https://shorturl.at/dvHYZ
2021: https://shorturl.at/cswF5
2022: https://shorturl.at/dsJX4
2023: https://shorturl.at/gpNVY
2024:https://igmhyderabad.spmcil.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/RTI-requests-and-replies-as-on-24.01.2024.pdf

Further, Production details of different years from 1957-2024 are hereby enclosed as per the available records.

7. In exercise of the powers, conferred upon the Appellate Authority under Section 19(6) of Right to Information Act, 2005, the appellate authority disposes of this first appeal with the above information.

8. **Accordingly, the Appeal stands disposed.**
The decision can be appealed against to CIC within a period of 90 days at below mentioned address or through the online RTI portal - https://dsscic.nic.in/online-appeal-application/onlineappealapplication.

Central Information Commission, CIC Bhawan, Baba Ganganath Marg, Munirka, New Delhi – 110 067.

Sd/-
(VNR NAYUDU)
APPELLATE AUTHORITY &
CHIEF GENERAL MANAGER

Place: Hyderabad
Date: February 23rd, 2024
F.No. IGMH/RTI/FAA/2021-22 /

To,
Shri. Banit,
S/O RAM RISHI , PO KHANDA,
TEHSIL: KHARKHODA,
DIST: SONIPAT,
HARYANA- 131 402.
Mobile: 7272020720

BEFORE THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

(Under the Right to Information Act, 2005)

INDIA GOVERNMENT MINT

(A Unit of SPMCIL)

IDA.Phase.II, HCL Post, Cherlapally, Hyderabad – 500 051

First Appeal No. IGMHY/A/E/24/00002 dated 25.01.2024

Challa Shiva Kumar	:	Appellant
	Vs.	
CPIO(Tech), IGMH, Hyderabad	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant filed an application under RTI Act, 2005 which has been forwarded to the Public Authority Under Section 6(3) of the RTI Act, 2005 on January 16th, 2024 under the Right to Information Act, 2005 ("**RTI Act**") through the RTI MIS Portal bearing Registration No: IGMHY/R/T/24/00003. The respondent disposed of the request vide his online reply dated January 18th, 2024 to the appellant. The appellant filed the present appeal dated January 25th, 2024 against the above response. I have carefully considered the application, the response and the Appeal and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record.

2. From the Appeal, I note that the appellant is aggrieved by the respondent's response to his application for not providing Attested letter of the reply.

Queries in the application:

Sl No.	Date of Application	Information sought
1	January 23rd, 2024	Requesting for the information under RTI Act, 2005. 1. 1 Rupee 1997 how many coins were minted Hyderabad mint house. 2. As per RTI Act, 2005 Section 7(2)2 please provide the information with duly attested by the respective CPIO. Concerned CPIO

3. The respondent provided the information to the appellant well within the prescribed period of time as per the provisions contained in the RTI Act, 2005.

4. **Grounds in Appeal –** The applicant raised the appeal as below:

> **"**Requested for the information under the Reference number IGMHY/R/T/24/00003, In the Application requested for the 2 point as follows 1. 1 Rupee 1997 how many coins were minted Hyderabad mint house. 2. As per RTI Act, 2005 Section 7(2)2 please provide the information with duly attested by the respective CPIO. Received the reply for the 1st point as "No information is available as per the records being

maintained by this office." And the second point is not follows and in don't understand the CPIO dont even know the process of reply of RTI, No attestation of letter even after mention. I request first appellate authority please look into and requesting for the information of, 1 Rupee 1997 how many coins were minted Hyderabad mint house."

5. **Points for Consideration:**

a) Whether the information requested by the Appellant was not provided to the Appellant as mandated by Section 7(2) of the RTI Act, 2005?

b) Whether due attestation is required for the information provided electronically?

The points standing for consideration of the FAA are dealt as below:

a) Whether the information requested by the Appellant was not provided to the Appellant as mandated by Section 7(2) of the RTI Act, 2005?

i) For the sake of brevity Section 7(1) & 7(2) of the RTI Act, 2005 is being reiterated below:

> *"7(2) If the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, fails to give decision on the request for information within the period specified under sub-section (1), the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, shall be deemed to have refused the request."*
>
> *7. (1) Subject to the proviso to sub-section (2) of section 5 or the proviso to subsection (3) of section 6, the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, on receipt of a request undersection 6 shall, as expeditiously as possible, and in any case within thirty days of the receipt of the request, either provide the information on payment of such fee as may be prescribed or reject the request for any of the reasons specified in sections 8 and 9: Provided that where the information sought for concerns the life or liberty of a person, the same shall be provided within forty-eight hours of the receipt of the request."*

ii) The FAA observes that, contents of the Sections reiterated above does not conform with the claims being made by the Appellant. Section 7(2) of the RTI Act only delves into the fact that when a request is considered as refused if information is not provided with in the statutory period provided under Section 7(1) of the Act. The section doesnot in any way deals with regard to the provisions of Certified copies or attested documents.

In view of the above, no further consideration in this regard is warranted by the FAA.

b) Whether due attestation is required for the information provided electronically?

i) As per the provisions of Section 4 of the Information Technology Act, 2005 all electronic records are legally recognised i.e. ***"Where any law provides that information or any other matter shall be in writing or in the typewritten or printed form, then, notwithstanding anything contained in such law, such***

requirement shall be deemed to have been satisfied if such information or matter is— (a) rendered or made available in an electronic form; and (b) accessible so as to be usable for a subsequent reference."

Hence, there is no statutory imposition/requirement has been casted upon the CPIO to provide certified copies of the information being provided electronically through RTI Portal. That apart, in the present circumstance it is observed that CPIO merely replied that "No information is available in the records being maintained in the office" and the CPIO did not provide any documents or records or extracts which have to be provided as True Copies or Certified copies in terms of the provisions contained in Section 2(j)(ii) of the RTI Act, 2005 and DoPT O.M.No.10/1/2013-IR dated 06.10.2015.

In view of the above, no further consideration in this regard is warranted by the FAA.

6. As far as the request of the Appellant with regard to provision of information on □ .1/- of 1997 minted by Hyderabad Mint is concerned, the FAA after verifying the concerned records is of the view the no information could be traced as per the records being maintained by the office.

7. In exercise of the powers, conferred upon the Appellate Authority under Section 19(6) of Right to Information Act, 2005, the appellate authority disposes of this first appeal with the above information.

8. **Accordingly, the Appeal stands disposed.**
The decision can be appealed against to CIC within a period of 90 days at below mentioned address or through the online RTI portal - https://dsscic.nic.in/online-appeal-application/onlineappealapplication.

Central Information Commission, CIC Bhawan, Baba Ganganath Marg, Munirka, New Delhi – 110 067.

Sd/-
(VNR NAYUDU)
APPELLATE AUTHORITY &
CHIEF GENERAL MANAGER

Place: Hyderabad
Date: February 23rd, 2024
F.No. IGMH/RTI/FAA/2021-22 /

To,
Shri. Challa Shiva Kumar,
#8-3-674, Bhagath Nagar,
Karimnagar – 505 001.
Mobile: 9700428266

ACTION HISTORY OF RTI FIRST APPEAL No.IGMHY/A/E/24/00003

Applicant Name	kapase santosh rajshekhar
Text of Appeal	I want to see my individual scores fpr the exam given by me - SUPERVISOR MECHANICAL.
Reply of Appeal	Dear Sir, I have perused your RTI First appeal and after verifying the reply of the CPIO and contents of the records, I note that the process of recruitment is yet to be finalised. Wherever Recruitment has been finalised, candidates marks have been displayed on the website. MArks of Supervisor(MEchanical) shall be displayed on the website once the final result of the same is declared. The First Appeal is accordingly disposed of. Yours Faithfully, FAA, IGMH

SN.	Action Taken	Date of Action	Action Taken By	Remarks
1	FIRST APPEAL RECEIVED	06/02/2024		
2	APPEAL FORWARDED TO CONCERNED FIRST APPELLATE AUTHORITY	20/02/2024	Nodal Officer	Online
3	APPEAL DISPOSED OF	26/02/2024	FAA - VNR NAYUDU	

Print

BEFORE THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

(Under the Right to Information Act, 2005)

INDIA GOVERNMENT MINT

(A Unit of SPMCIL)

IDA.Phase.II, HCL Post, Cherlapally, Hyderabad – 500 051

First Appeal No. IGMHY/A/E/24/00004 dated 09.02.2024

Pasham Sainath	:	Appellant
	Vs.	
CPIO(HR), IGMH, Hyderabad	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant filed an application under RTI Act, 2005 on January 16th, 2024 under the Right to Information Act, 2005 ("**RTI Act**") through the RTI MIS Portal bearing Registration No: IGMHY/R/E/24/00008. The respondent disposed of the request vide his online reply dated February 06th, 2024 to the appellant. The appellant filed the present appeal dated February 09th, 2024 against the above response. I have carefully considered the application, the response and the Appeal and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record.

2. From the Appeal, I note that the appellant is aggrieved by the respondent's response to his application for not resolving his grievance for constitution of Review DPC.

Queries in the application:

Sl No.	Date of Application	Information sought
1	January 16th, 2024	Sir, Ref1: No.1-302/Review DPC/Per./2023-24/652 dated:06.07.2023 (Attached) Ref2: Grievance Id:1057 in public grievance redressal portal (Attached) With reference to above Please provide copy of reply received for Ref1 from CHO and also provide present status of my review DPC as per Ref2 of online public grievance redressal portal of SPMCIL Shri Sriharsha sir replied in march 2023 that issue is under consideration of competent authority but still my grievance is not resolved.

3. The respondent provided the information to the appellant well within the prescribed period of time as per the provisions contained in the RTI Act, 2005.

4. **Grounds in Appeal –** The applicant raised the appeal as below:

> "Ref1:No.1-302/Review DPC/Per./2023-24/652 date:06.07.2023
> In continuation, want to bring to your notice and submit following to your good office:
> a) Coronavirus, or COVID-19(Pandemic), had a significant impact on India since its outbreak in early 2020. The virus spread rapidly across India, with the first case reported in year 2020 up to year 2022, millions of cases were reported across the

country and thousands of people have lost their lives. To curb the spread of the virus, the Indian government imposed several nationwide lockdowns and implemented strict restrictions on movement, gatherings, and businesses. The pandemic had profound social implications, affecting education, mental health, and social interactions. Disruptions in schooling, isolation measures, and economic hardships had lasting effects on communities across the country. Overall, the COVID-19 pandemic had a multifaceted impact on India, affecting health, economy, society, and governance.

b) IGM Hyderabad also issued circulars, notices and office orders from year 2020 to year 2022 to strictly adhere to covid-19 protocols and all related precautionary measures issued by MOH and FW and Govt of telangana from time to time.

c) It is duty and responsibility of DPC to estimate number of vacancies as accurately as possible considering vacancies arising in a post/grade/service in the relevant vacancy year due to retirement, regular long term promotion and deputation.

d) With reference to ref1 it is understood that DPC held on 30.06.2020 has not taken all material facts into consideration or material facts have not been brought to the notice of the DPC(Non reporting of vacancies due to error or omission which is injustice to me because it is artificially restricting zone of consideration) and as I was qualified & eligible for promotion to S2 Level as on 30.06.2020 due to superannuation of shri A.T.Ajai Senior Supervisor S2 on 30.06.2020 but I was omitted to be considered for promotion to S2 level wef 01.07.2020 by DPC held on 30.06.2020.

e) In view of all above my representation for review DPC was considered and facts were brought out in the DPC held on 30.06.2023 and the DPC has recommended to seek clarification from CHO for reviewing my promotion date as 30.06.2020 instead of 01.01.2021 as the same will affect the seniority available in the gradation list same detailed in letter ref1.

f) Reply to ref1 was given by CHO through mail dated 18.07.2023 which clearly stated that promotion of S1 and S2 level supervisors falls under jurisdiction of unit level and also directed to review my DPC as per promotion policy of machine staff, In this regard request your intervention for my review DPC as noted in DPC held on 30.06.2023(my promotion date as 30.06.2020 instead of 01.01.2021) and resolve my grievance please."

5. Perused the RTI Query, Reply of the CPIO & Appeal of the Appellant.

6. On perusal of RTI Query & Reply of the CPIO it is found that the reply tendered by the CPIO is satisfactory. Further, on scrutiny of the First Appeal it is found that the Appellant has not actually filed the instant appeal for non-provision or incomplete provision of information by the CPIO. However, it is found that the Appellant has sought to resolve his grievance through this instant appeal. It is to state that under the provisions of the RTI Act, the FAA can only deal with the issues that have been earlier dealt with by the CPIO and proper information has not been given. Even common law principles provide that, in an appellate proceeding, the appellate forum can only delve into the facts dealt earlier by the lower level authority and no fresh additional submission can be made.

7. It is to be noted that, a Request or an Appeal under the Provisions of RTI Act, 2005 is not for redressal/resolution for any grievance. In this regard, the Central Information Commission

in the matter of Sh. Triveni Prasad Bahuguna v. LIC of India, Lucknow in Decision No. CIC/DS/A/2012/ 000906 dated 06.09.2012, had observed as follows:

> ***"The Appellant is informed that … redressal of grievance does not fall within the ambit of the RTI Act rather it is up to the Appellant to approach the correct grievance redressal forum…".***

Moreover, in the matter of H. K. Bansal v. CPIO & GM (OP), MTNL in Decision No. CIC/LS/A/2011/000982/BS/1786 dated 29.01.2013, the Commission had observed as follows:

> ***"The RTI Act is not the proper law for redressal of grievances/disputes and there are other appropriate forum(s) for resolving such matters."***

Further, in the matter of Pratap Singh v. CPIO, Supreme Court of India; (2019 SCC OnLine CIC 1230.) Central Information Commission has observed as under:

> ***"RTI Act is not the proper law for redressal of grievances and there are other appropriate fora for resolving such matters. ..."***

8. In view of the foregoing observations, the FAA observes that due information has been provided to the appellant by the respondent and records that the RTI Act is not the proper law for the redressal of grievances and there are other appropriate fora for resolving such matters.

9. Hence, no further intervention of the FAA is required in the matter.

10. In exercise of the powers, conferred upon the Appellate Authority under Section 19(6) of Right to Information Act, 2005, the appellate authority disposes of this first appeal with the above observations.

11. **Accordingly, the Appeal stands disposed.**
The decision can be appealed against to CIC within a period of 90 days at below mentioned address or through the online RTI portal - https://dsscic.nic.in/online-appeal-application/onlineappealapplication.

Central Information Commission, CIC Bhawan, Baba Ganganath Marg, Munirka, New Delhi – 110 067.

Sd/-

Place: Hyderabad **(VNR NAYUDU)**
Date: March 05th, 2024 **APPELLATE AUTHORITY &**
F.No. IGMH/RTI/FAA/2021-22 / **CHIEF GENERAL MANAGER**

To,
Shri. Pasham Sainath, H.No.1-64, Hydershakote, Bandlaguda Jagir Municipal Corporation, Hyderabad- 500091
Mobile: 9030397503

ACTION HISTORY OF RTI FIRST APPEAL No.IGMHY/A/E/24/00005

Applicant Name	ROHIT MENON
Text of Appeal	Information requested in incomplete. The number of tokens/medal sold, Issue date of token/medal should be available in SPMCIL records. Kindly provide the requested information for the following tokens/medals. Number of tokens/medal sold Issue date of token/medal . Bhagmati - Charminar Bhagmati - Golkonda Muhammad Quli Qutb Shah-Charminar Muhammad Quli Qutb Shah-Golkonda Bhagmati -Muhammad Quli Qutb Shah Charminar-Golkonda
Reply of Appeal	Appeal No:IGMHY/A/E/24/00005 dated: 27.02.2024. Date of Disposal of the Appeal: 04.03.2024 Order 1) Shri.Rohit Menon has filed an RTI Request bearing Reg.no.IGMHY/R/E/24/00037 dated 18.02.2024, Seeking certain details. 2) The RTI has been forwarded by the Nodal officer to CPIO(F&A) in part and CPIO(Tech) in Part. 3) Whereas, the information with regard to the issue price of the Medals/Tokens has been forwarded to CPIO(F&A), information pertaining to QUantity/Issue Date/Die has been forwarded to CPIO(Tech) by the nodal officer. 4) Accordingly, CPIO(F&A) has provided requisite information as transferred with respect to Issue price of the Tokens well within the prescribed period under RTI Act. 5) Further, it is seen as on the date of disposal of the Present first appeal that CPIO(Technical) is yet to provide information as to the aspects of Quantity/Issue Date/Die Details. 6) In view of the above, no fault can be found as far as the information provided by the CPIO(F&A). 7) WIth the above observations the appeal stands disposed of. The decision can be appealed against to CIC within a period of 90 days at below mentioned address or through the online RTI portal - https://dsscic.nic.in/online-appeal-application/onlineappealapplication. Central Information Commission, CIC Bhawan, Baba Ganganath Marg, Munirka, New Delhi – 110 067. VNR Nayudu, CGM & Appellate Authority.

SN.	Action Taken	Date of Action	Action Taken By	Remarks
1	FIRST APPEAL RECEIVED	27/02/2024		
2	APPEAL FORWARDED TO CONCERNED FIRST APPELLATE AUTHORITY	04/03/2024	Nodal Officer	Online
3	APPEAL DISPOSED OF	04/03/2024	FAA - VNR NAYUDU	

Print

ACTION HISTORY OF RTI FIRST APPEAL No.IGMHY/A/E/24/00006

Applicant Name	TAMILMANI. S
Text of Appeal	Dear sir/madam, I want to know the information Please provide details of advt no-01/2023. MY REGISTRATION NO. : 347008381 ROLL NO. / USER ID : 1110000057 01. I wrote engraver (metal works) exam. I am the only one candidate wrote for this exam. My score is 48 - (OBC) category. I have not been called for document verification yet. 02. Am I selected or not? For this job. I am received mark sheet only. Thank you so much!!! Tamilmani (he/him).
Reply of Appeal	First Appeal No:IGMHY/A/E/24/00006 Date: 05.03.2024 Name of the Appellant: Mr.TamilMani S CPIO: CPIO(HR), IGMH. Order 1) An RTI Request was filed by the Appellant on 26.02.2024 seeking the status of the Results of Engraver(metal Works). 2) The concerned CPIO has disposed of the request on 26.02.2024 with relevant information within the timeline as per the provisions of the RTI Act. 3) The Appellant has filed the present first appeal on 05.03.2024 being not satisfied with the reply of the CPIO and sought the following relief: "I want to know the information Please provide details of advt no-01/2023. MY REGISTRATION NO. : 347008381 ROLL NO. / USER ID : 1110000057 01. I wrote engraver (metal works) exam. I am the only one candidate wrote for this exam. My score is 48 - (OBC) category. I have not been called for document verification yet. 02. Am I selected or not? For this job. I am received mark sheet only." 4) Perused the material on record and noted the contentions of the Appellant. 5) After perusing the material, I am of the view that the information provided by the CPIO is satisfactory. Further, it is to note that under the provisions of the RTI Act only such information as is available in the records can be provided, CPIO cannot provide information to hypothetical information nor he is bound to interpret any information. 6) With the above observations the RTI First Appeal is diposed of. 7) The Order can be appealed before the Central Information Commission, Munirka, New Delhi or on its portal cic.gov.in. VNR NAYUDU, FAA & Chief General Manager.

SN.	Action Taken	Date of Action	Action Taken By	Remarks
1	FIRST APPEAL RECEIVED	05/03/2024		
2	APPEAL FORWARDED TO CONCERNED FIRST APPELLATE AUTHORITY	22/03/2024	Nodal Officer	Online
3	APPEAL DISPOSED OF	22/03/2024	FAA - VNR NAYUDU	

Print

ACTION HISTORY OF RTI FIRST APPEAL No.IGMHY/A/E/24/00007

Applicant Name	surendra kushwaha
Text of Appeal	Q1.MINTAGE OF 2RS. COIN DEPICTING AGRICULTURAL DOMINANCE OF THE COUNTRY BY HYDERABAD MINT BETWEEN 1-1-2022 TO 31-12-2022? Q2.MINTAGE OF 5RS. COIN DEPICTING AGRICULTURAL DOMINANCE OF THE COUNTRY BY HYDERABAD MINT BETWEEN 1-1-2022 TO 31-12-2022? Q3.MINTAGE OF 10RS. COIN DEPICTING AGRICULTURAL DOMINANCE OF THE COUNTRY BY HYDERABAD MINT BETWEEN 1-1-2022 TO 31-12-2022? Q4.MINTAGE OF 20RS. COIN DEPICTING AGRICULTURAL DOMINANCE OF THE COUNTRY BY HYDERABAD MINT BETWEEN 1-1-2022 TO 31-12-2022? PLEASE PROVIDE REPLY IN PDF FORMAT AND IN QUESTION ANSWER FORMAT
Reply of Appeal	First Appeal No:IGMHY/A/E/24/00007 Date: 17.04.2024 Name of the Appellant: Mr.Surendra Kushwaha CPIO: CPIO(Technical), IGMH. Order 1) An RTI Request was filed by the Appellant on 16.04.2024 seeking Mintage of Various denomination of coins pertaining to Agricultural Dominance. 2) The concerned CPIO has disposed of the request on 17.04.2024 with relevant information within the timeline as per the provisions of the RTI Act. 3) The Appellant has filed the present first appeal on 17.04.2024 being not satisfied with the reply of the CPIO and sought the following relief: "PLEASE PROVIDE REPLY IN PDF FORMAT AND IN QUESTION ANSWER FORMAT." 4) Perused the material on record and noted the contentions of the Appellant. 5) After perusing the material, I am of the view that the information provided by the CPIO is satisfactory. It is to note here that CPIO has already provided requisite information as sought. Further, it is to note that under the provisions of the RTI Act, the information as is available in the records can be provided, the Applicant cannot seek to receive information in a certain format or compilation. It is further seen that the Appellant did not seek to provide in such a format in his RTI Application and cannot seek the same in the Appellate Stage. 6) With the above observations the RTI First Appeal is diposed of. 7) The Order can be appealed before the Central Information Commission, Munirka, New Delhi or on its portal cic.gov.in. VNR NAYUDU, FAA & Chief General Manager.

SN.	Action Taken	Date of Action	Action Taken By	Remarks
1	FIRST APPEAL RECEIVED	17/04/2024		
2	APPEAL FORWARDED TO CONCERNED FIRST APPELLATE AUTHORITY	24/04/2024	Nodal Officer	Online
3	APPEAL DISPOSED OF	25/04/2024	FAA - VNR NAYUDU	

Print

ACTION HISTORY OF RTI FIRST APPEAL No.IGMHY/A/E/24/00008

Applicant Name	Sourav Chatterji
Text of Appeal	1) Roles and responsibilities of all the workmen recruited under the advertisement no. 02/2023
Reply of Appeal	First Appeal No:IGMHY/A/E/24/00008 Date: 18.04.2024 Name of the Appellant: Mr.Sourav Chatterji CPIO: CPIO(HR), IGMH. Order 1) An RTI Request was filed by the Appellant on 02.04.2024 seeking Roles and responsibilities of Various posts in the Cadre of Junior Technician. 2) The concerned CPIO has disposed of the request on 10.04.2024 with relevant information within the timeline as per the provisions of the RTI Act. 3) The Appellant has filed the present first appeal on 18.04.2024 being not satisfied with the reply of the CPIO and sought the following relief: "1) Roles and responsibilities of all the workmen recruited under the advertisement no. 02/2023 ." 4) Perused the material on record and noted the contentions of the Appellant. 5) After perusing the material, I am of the view that the information provided by the CPIO is satisfactory. Further, it is to note that under the provisions of the RTI Act only such information as is available in the records can be provided, CPIO cannot provide information to hypothetical questions for which no information is available in the records nor he is bound to interpret any information. 6) With the above observations the RTI First Appeal is diposed of. 7) The Order can be appealed before the Central Information Commission, Munirka, New Delhi or on its portal cic.gov.in. VNR NAYUDU, FAA & Chief General Manager.

SN.	Action Taken	Date of Action	Action Taken By	Remarks
1	FIRST APPEAL RECEIVED	18/04/2024		
2	APPEAL FORWARDED TO CONCERNED FIRST APPELLATE AUTHORITY	24/04/2024	Nodal Officer	Online
3	APPEAL DISPOSED OF	25/04/2024	FAA - VNR NAYUDU	

Print