

**GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI**  
**OFFICE OF THE MEDICAL SUPERINTENDENT**  
**RAO TULA RAM MEMORIAL HOSPITAL**  
**JAFFARPUR, NEW DELHI-110073**

F.No.RTRMH-I/6/RTI Appeal No.12/2013-14/1802-04

Dated: 14/2/14

**ORDER**

The appeal filed by Dr. Parvinder Singh, Jr. Specialist, Forensic Medicine, RTRM Hospital under Section 19 of the RTI Act, 2005 regarding his RTI Application (ID No.92) had been fixed earlier for hearing on 10/02/2014 but due to exigency it was re-fixed for 11/02/2014 at 10:30 AM vide order of even No. dated 07/02/2014 and notified to the appellant. The appeal was heard on 11/02/2014 at 10:30 AM. The PIO, APIO and the Appellant were present in the hearing.

2. The PIO clarified that all replies given to the appellant and the information given to him were factual and correct. The PIO further sought permission of the FAA to respond to the comments of the appellant given in his appeal. The point wise decisions are as under:

i) Reg. Answer 1 & 4: The appellant stated that PIO has given wrong, incorrect and misleading information but he failed to prove as how it was wrong, incorrect and misleading.

Decision of FAA: The contention of the appellant was found insubstantial. Hence the appellant agreed to the reply given by the PIO.

ii) Reg. Answer 5: The PIO agreed that the reply from Vigilance Officer was inadequate and he has to clarify the provision under which complainant has to give reply to the fact finding enquiry.

Decision of FAA: The PIO is directed to obtain requisite information from the Vigilance Officer and provide the same to the applicant within one week of issue of this order.

iii) Reg. Answer 6: The appellant stated that the reply given by PIO is misleading but the appellant failed to prove as how it was misleading.

Decision of FAA: The contention of the appellant was found insubstantial. Hence the appellant agreed to the reply given by the PIO.

iv) Reg. Answer 8: The appellant stated that the reply given by the PIO is vague, wrong and incorrect.

The PIO justified her response as correct as the information is covered under section 8(1) (e) and 8 (1)(j) of RTI Act,2005 and hence declined.

Decision of FAA: The contention of PIO was found reasonable and accepted.

v) Reg. Answer 9: The appellant stated that the reply given by the PIO is wrong.

The PIO informed that the reply of letter dated 14.10.2013 and reminder dated 6.12.2013 has already been given vide letter dated 27.11.2013 and 6.01.2014.

Decision of FAA: The contention of PIO was found reasonable and accepted. PIO is directed to provide a copy of reply dated 27.11.2013 and 6.01.2014 again to the appellant within one week.

vi) Reg. Answer 10: The appellant stated that the name of the officers who dealt with the documents mentioned in question 9 and time taken by them to deal with these documents has not been disclosed.

The PIO informed that the both letters were dealt in vigilance branch of RTRM Hospital by the concerned dealing assistants/officers and the date when these documents were received was informed to the appellant.

Decision of FAA: The PIO is directed to obtain requisite information from the Vigilance Officer and provide the same to the applicant within one week of issue of this order.

In case, the appellant is not satisfied with decision, he may file a Second Appeal under RTI Act, 2005 within 90 days from the issue of this order before the Information Commissioner, Central Information Commissioner, Room No.326, II<sup>nd</sup> Floor, August Kranti Bhawan, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066.

Encl. as above.

**(Dr. Ashok Kumar)**  
**First Appellate Authority/**  
**Medical Supdt., RTRM Hospital**

F.No.RTRMH-I/6/RTI Appeal No.12/2013-14/

Dated:

Copy to :

1. Dr. Parvindar Singh, Jr. Specialist, Forensic Medicine, RTRM Hospital, Jaffarpur, New Delhi-110073.
2. PIO, RTRM Hospital.
3. PA to FAA/MS, RTRM Hospital.

**(Dr. Ashok Kumar)**  
**First Appellate Authority/**  
**Medical Supdt., RTRM Hospital**