

DESPATCHED
On... 08/06/2020



**STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION, KERALA
PUNNEN ROAD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695 001**

Tel: 0471 2561600, 2561613, 2561614, 2561615 Fax: 0471 2330920

Email: sic.ker@nic.in

**Proceedings of the Appeal Petition No.1172(6)/2015/SIC
(File No.7302/SIC-Gen5/2015)**

PRESENT

Vinson M. Paul, Chief Information Commissioner

Sri. Sudeep S.D.,
Convenor, Perspektiva : The English
Research Forum,
Sree Sankaracharya University of Sanskrit,
Kalady, Kalady P.O., Ernakulam- 683 574. } Appellant

1. The State Public Information Officer,
Sree Sankaracharya University of Sanskrit,
Kalady, Kalady P.O., Ernakulam- 683 574. } Respondents
2. The Appellate Authority,
Sree Sankaracharya University of Sanskrit,
Kalady, Kalady P.O., Ernakulam- 683 574. }

Date of application u/s 6(1)	6.1.2015
Date of reply	5.2.2015
Date of filing first Appeal	13.2.2015
Date of decision on the first Appeal	14.9.2015
Date of filing 2 nd appeal in the Commission	2.5.2015
Date of receipt of 2 nd appeal in the Commission	6.5.2015
Date of Report called for by the Commission	2.6.2015
Date of receipt of report in the Commission	12.6.2015
Date & Venue of Hearing conducted	6.3.2020, Video Conference Hall, Collectorate, Ernakulam
Presence in the Hearing	SPIO Present. Appellant absent.

ORDER

Appeal Petitioner Sri. Sudeep S.D., represented before the Commission that the information sought by him in item no. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 12 in his application were not furnished to him by the first Respondent. Similarly the information furnished with regard to item No. 9 was incomplete or wrong. Though an appeal was filed before the 2nd Respondent, no reply was received from him till date.

2. In his application submitted before the first Respondent, the Appellant sought the following information :

- i) what are the essential qualifications for the approval of a research guide.
- ii) whether Dr. Jenny Rappai, Associate Professor, Department of English had fulfilled all the qualifications when she applied for approval as a research guide.
- iii) whether the criteria were relaxed to approve her as a research guide and so on numbering to 12 items.

Reply to the above application was furnished by the 1st Respondent. The Appellant filed his 1st appeal before the 2nd Respondent stating that wrong information was provided to him with regard to item 9 and that no information was furnished with regard to items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 12.

3. In the report furnished to the Commission by the 1st Respondent, it was stated that the information sought by the Appellant in items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 12 were not readily available for answering those questions. Thereafter, the information was furnished by the sections concerned and based on the above information the appellate authority furnished the information to the Appellant in full.

4. On scrutinizing the appeal petition and connected documents, the Commission finds that there was unjustifiable delay on the part of the

Respondents in furnishing information to the Appellant with regard to items 2,3,4,5,6,7 & 12. The explanation that those details had to be collected from the sections concerned and that the reply could be furnished only on 3.6.2015 cannot be justified. The Commission directs the 1st Respondent to furnish his explanation with regard to the delay in furnishing information relating to the above items. The explanation should reach the Commission within 15 days of receipt of this order. If no explanation is received within the prescribed time limit, the Commission will be constrained to issue final orders under section 20(1) of the RTI Act. If the above Respondent wants to represent anything in person before the Commission, the same should be made clear in his explanation.

5. The Commission does not find any merit in the allegations of the Appellant that the information with regard to item 9 was incomplete or wrong. He has not produced any material before the Commission to substantiate his allegation. The Commission finds that there was inordinate delay on the part of the 2nd Respondent in furnishing reply to the Appellant within the prescribed time limit as specified under section 19(6) of the RTI Act. The Commission warns the 2nd Respondent against such inordinate delay.

6. The Commission provisionally disposes of this appeal petition as stated above on the 6th day of March, 2020.

Sd/-

Vinson M. Paul
Chief Information Commissioner



Authenticated Copy

Additional Secretary (Law)

bnk/

