

3. 18.01.2007 Complaint Case No.192 of 2006

1. Complainant is absent. The PIO-Opposite Party is present. Absence of the Complainant is immaterial since the case is posted to today for fixation of liability, if any, on the PIO for having violated the provisions of Section 7(1) of the RTI Act, 2005 (Act for short).
2. Since the Complainant is absent, it is not possible for the State Commission to ascertain if he has received the information. However the Opposite Party has submitted compliance vide his letter No.10246 dated 30.10.06 which clearly shows that information have been supplied to the Complainant.
3. It is also seen from the letter No.3947 dated 20.7.06 sent by the PIO to the Complainant that his application has been rejected as the amount of fee has been deposited in a wrong Head of Account. When the said intimation has been given by the PIO in due time he could not be faulted in Law.
4. For the reasons aforesaid there is no need to prolong the proceeding any more against the PIO. The State Commission while exonerating the PIO-Opposite Party direct that the proceeding against the Opposite Party be dropped.

Nav Kumar

SIC 18.1.07

*Subrat
18/1/07*