

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

2nd Floor, August Kranti Bhawan,
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066

Decision No. CIC/AB/A/2016/000004

Dated 22.08.2017

Appellant : Shri Pramod K.K.

Respondent : The Central Public Information Officer,
Bharat Dynamics Ltd, MoD,
Kanchanbagh, Hyderabad-500 058.

Date of Hearing : 12.07.2017/22.08.2017

Relevant dates emerging from the appeal:

RTI application : 08.06.2015
CPIO's reply : 10.07.2015
First appeal : 10.08.2015
FAA's order : 22.09.2015
Second Appeal : 26.01.2016

ORDER

1. The appellant filed an online application under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) before the Assistant Public Information Officer (APIO), Bharat Dynamics Limited (BDL), Hyderabad seeking information on ten points pertaining to reimbursement of medical bills including, inter-alia, (i) reasons as to why the medical bills of the appellant's mother have not been reimbursed and (ii) reasons as to why no information was provided to him by the BDL, Bhanur Management regarding the delay in reimbursement of the bills.

2. The appellant filed a second appeal before the Commission on the grounds that incomplete information has been provided to him by the CPIO and that the First Appellate Authority (FAA) had incorrectly dismissed his first

appeal. The appellant requested the Commission to direct the CPIO to provide the information sought by him and to award him compensation for the loss suffered by him due to denial of information by the CPIO and the FAA.

Hearing on 12.07.2017:

3. The appellant, Shri Pramod K.K. attended the hearing through video conferencing. The respondent was not present despite notice.

Interim Decision:

4. Due to some unforeseen circumstances, the matter could not be taken up for hearing. The matter is adjourned to **22.08.2017 at 10.30 am**.

Hearing on 22.08.2017:

5. The appellant Shri Pramod K.K. and the respondent Shri A. Satish Chakravarty, Sr. Manager and CPIO, BDL, Hyderabad attended the hearing through video conferencing

6. The appellant submitted that he is not satisfied with the reply furnished by the respondent as the information provided is confusing and misleading. The appellant further submitted that he was not informed about the reasons as to why the medical bills were not sanctioned and reimbursed.

7. The respondent submitted that point wise information as per the available records has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 10.07.2015. The respondent further submitted that the FAA vide order dated 22.09.2015 had upheld the reply of the CPIO. The respondent also stated that the appellant had raised additional issues at the First Appellate Stage, which cannot be answered since additional issues are not entertained at the appellate stage. Hence, no further information remains to be provided to the appellant.

Decision:

8. The Commission, after hearing the submissions of both the parties and perusing the records, observes that the appellant is not satisfied with the order of the FAA as the additional queries raised in the first appeal have not

been addressed. The Commission further observes that queries raised in the first appeal are different from the ones raised in the RTI application, which the appellant is not entitled to at the Appellate stage. The Commission notes that since the information sought in the RTI application has been provided to the appellant by the respondent, no further intervention of the Commission is required in the matter.

9. With the above observations, the appeal is disposed of.

10. Copy of the decision be provided free of cost to the parties.

(Sudhir Bhargava)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(S.S. Rohilla)
Designated Officer