The appellant is not present. The Public Authority is represented by Mr. Sandeep, DA.

FACTS:

2. The Appellant through his RTI application dated 16.1.2014 had sought copy of action taken pursuant to CVC letter dated 14.5.2013, which was forwarded to RCS by the Dept of Vigilance under their letter dt 13.7.2012, reply of the respondent to the same, etc.
3. On not receiving any reply within the prescribed time, the appellant made first appeal.

4. FAA vide order dated 9.4.2014 directed the PIO to provide the requisite information as available with them.

5. Claiming non-compliance of FAA order, the appellant has approached the Commission in second appeal.

DECISION

6. The appellant is not present. The respondent authority made their submissions. The respondent officer submitted that the appellant made a number of RTI applications against the Housing Society management. He has also complained against the arbitrator. He sought the details about the property of various officers of RCS. He further submitted that the appellant is filing multiple RTI applications without any rhyme or reason. In one RTI application, he asked about 20 RTI questions, which is very difficult for the Department to compile and give.

7. The Commission observes that this appellant is abusing the RTI Act and choking the department with frivolous, vexatious and unnecessary RTI applications. In one of the cases which came in Second Appeal, the Commission had ordered inspection of the records. Instead of availing the inspection, the appellant filed some other RTI application on the same subject. The Commission, therefore, directs the Respondent authority to prepare a comprehensive note regarding the questions sought by the appellant and the
reply of the department on the same, to be uploaded in their official web site along with this order, and any further RTI applications in future, can be referred to the note on the website. The Commission also advises the appellant not to file repeated RTI applications which are aimless and useless. The Commission also advises the respondent authority not to share any personal information of the officers with the people like the appellant without invoking Section 11 of the RTI Act.

8. In view of the above, the Commission **rejects** the present Second appeal.

(M.Sridhar Acharyulu)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(Babu Lal)
Deputy Registrar

Addresses of the parties:

1. The PIO under the RTI Act,
   Govt. of NCT of Delhi
   Registrar of Cooperative Societies, Parliament Street
   New Delhi-110001

2. Sh. S.K.T.Sherman
   Flat No.B-54, Sri Ram CGHS Ltd. Plot No.32,
   Sector-4, Dwarka, New Delhi-110078