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ORDER

Facts:
1. The appellant filed RTI application dated 11.08.2015 seeking information regarding copy of suspension notice and departmental enquiry against Shri Shahid A' Khan working as a technician in SIRD Division of BARC etc.

2. The CPIO responded on 19.08.2015. The appellant filed first appeal dated 28.08.2015 before the first appellate authority (FAA). The FAA responded on 20.10.2015. The appellant filed second appeal to the Commission on 29.01.2016 on the ground that information should be provided to him.

Hearing:
3. The appellant and the respondent participated in the hearing.
4. The appellant stated that he has been provided unsatisfactory reply. The appellant stated that the employee about whom the information is sought for is
a public servant, thus the sought for information cannot be covered under section 8(1) (j) of the RTI Act. The appellant stated that the employee about whom the information sought for has suppressed the material information of a criminal case against him.

5. The respondent stated that the information request by the appellant relates to personal information of the employee concerned and its disclosure has no relationship to any public activity or interest. The respondent stated that the disclosure of the information would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the individual. The respondent stated that the sought for information is exempted under section 8(1) (j) of the RTI Act.

Discussion/ observation:

6. It is settled law that the suspension notice/order, Departmental Enquiry is personal information and is a matter between the employee and the employer. Thus, such information cannot be disclosed unless larger public interest involved. In the instant matter, no larger public interest involved.

7. The action/steps taken by the respondent in dealing with the RTI application are satisfactory.

Decision:

8. The Commission's intervention is not required in the matter.

The appeal is disposed of. Copy of the order be given to the parties free of cost.
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