

### **Background of Sh. H.K.Bansal, the Appellant**

Sh. H.K.Bansal, the Appellant is a Retired Civil Engineer, an Engg. Services Officer of 1976 U.P.S.C. Batch. He wanted promotion to the grade of Chief Engineer (Civil) on 20.05.2005 but his name was not considered in the DPC held on 18.05.2005 for selecting a panel for promotion to the grade of Chief Engineer(Civil) under the provisions of FR 35 due to non availability of ACRs. He had submitted many representations on the same subject matter since 20.05.2005. Those representations were considered and followed up in DPCs (30.09.2005 & 06.12.2005). The DPC concluded on 06.12.2005"....**The DPC considered that the officer has deliberately not submitted self appraisal wherever he felt that he may not get very good or outstanding as is clear from record. It amounts to indiscipline and willfully not submitted his self appraisal.....** DPC finds the officer not fit."After his permanent absorption in Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited (BSNL), he retired on 31.05.2007 as Superintending Engineer (Civil) on attaining the age of superannuation.

**Comprehensive Note on the RTI cases from Sh. H.K.Bansal,  
dealt by CE(Civil) unit as CPIO**

**Case No. 1**

- Er. H.K.Bansal, the applicant submitted a RTI application No. HKB/PF/RTI(1)/Vol. II dated 08.02.2010 under RTI Act 2005 to GM(QA&OP) & CPIO, C.O, through Sr. Supdt. Of Post Offices, Rohtak Division, Rohtak. The applicant sought the information in the said RTI application under 62 points.
- GM(QA&OP) & CPIO, C.O, forwarded the same to other four GMs and the information was supplied to the applicant.
- The appellant filed an appeal vide No. HKB/RTI(03)/01/Vol. II/Pt II dated 26.05.2010 .
- PGM(D) & 1<sup>st</sup> Appellate Authority, Delhi unit referred the 1<sup>st</sup> appeal Case No. 27 on 27.08.2010 to GM(Comml.) & 1<sup>st</sup> Appellate Authority, C.O., for furnishing the final reply to the applicant being a first Appellate Authority of the entire case.
- The appellant filed 2nd appeal vide No. HKB/RTI(03)/01-Vol. II/Pt-II dated 21.01.2011 to CIC for:-
  - i) To order the concerned Public Authority for supply of correct requested information in a time bound manner free of cost.
  - ii) To order for taking Disciplinary action against the individuals responsible for adopting misleading/twisting approach and for harassing the information seeker.
  - iii) To impose fine for the deliberate delay in supply of the requested information
  - iv) To order for any other relief as considered appropriate/proper in the facts & circumstances of the case.
- CIC after hearing the case on 29.01.2013 issued the decision vide No. CIC/LS/A/2011/000982/BS/1786 dated 29.01.2013. The commission directed the CPIO, Corporate office to permit the Appellant to inspect the relevant files/ records. In view of the submissions of CPIO that multiple RTI applications filed by the Appellant seeking huge and voluminous information held by various CPIOs is causing undue strain on the resources of the Public Authority, the Commission hoped that the Appellant will take a careful note of the observations and refrain from misusing the provisions of the RTI Act as it is not the proper law for redressal of grievances/disputes and there are other appropriate forum(s) for resolving such matters.

