

Central Information Commission

No.CIC/OK/C/2006/00049

Dated: 5 February 2007

Name of the Complainant : Ms. Gita Diwan Verma,
1356, DI Vasant Kunj,
New Delhi - 110 070.

Name of the Public Authority : Delhi Metro Rail Corporation Limited

Background:

Ms. Gita Dewan Verma of Delhi had filed a complaint in this Commission about non-implementation of Section 4 of the RTI Act in Delhi Metro Rail Corporation Limited (DMRC) and also complained that the DMRC did not reply to her RTI application which was sent through e-mail. Comments of the PIO were called for and the PIO replied that the information sought for by her through e-mail was duly replied in spite of the fact that she did not deposit the application fees of Rs.10/-. The Complainant on the other hand argued that DMRC did not have their system in place and as such she could not deposit the fees.

2. The Complainant filed a rejoinder against the information supplied by the Respondents. It basically revolves around differences of opinion between the Complainant and the Respondents about the interpretation of Section 4(1) of the RTI Act. The Complainant also sent a letter to the Commission stating that she had come across an objectionable reference about her on the website of the DMRC which she wanted the DMRC to remove forthwith.

3. The case was fixed for hearing on 1 February 2007.

4. The bench of Dr. O.P. Kejariwal, Information Commissioner, heard the matter.

5. Shri Anuj Dayal, CPIO, Shri R.M. Rania, Adviser (Property Development) and Shri Saikat Chakraborty, Assistant Manager (PR), represented the Respondents.

6. The Complainant, Ms. Gita Dewan Verma, was present in person.

Decision

7. The Commission heard both the sides. The Complainant maintained that she had filed a supplementary affidavit seeking clarifications on several issues and the Respondents had sent the clarifications on some of them. She had, however, sent a rejoinder on these clarifications to the Commission but a copy had not gone to the Respondents and they were not aware of the objections made or the additional information sought. The Commission, therefore, handed over a copy of the Complainant's rejoinder to the Respondents and directed them to clarify the issues/provide information asked for by 21 February 2007. In case they are not able to provide the requisite information, they should give their reasons for doing so.

8. During the hearing, the Complainant brought to the notice of the Commission a write-up on the website of the DMRC which stated that the Respondents had not responded to some questions of the Complainant as the requisite fee had not been paid by her. The Commission directed them to modify their write up on their website and remove any reference to the Complainant.

Sd/-
(O.P. Kejariwal)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy:

Sd/-
(Pankaj K.P. Shreyaskar)
Assistant Registrar

Cc:

1. Ms. Gita Dewan Verma, 1356 D-I, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi-110070
2. Shri Anuj Dayal, CPRO & Public Information Officer, DMRC Ltd., NBCC Place, Bishma Pitamah Marg, Pragati Vihar, New Delhi-110003
3. Officer Incharge, NIC
4. Press E Group, CIC