

RPAD

**BEFORE THE REGISTRAR OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES-CUM-FIRST APPELLATE
AUTHORITY UNDER THE RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT, 2005**

Present: **Thiru. T. KARIKALAN,**
Registrar of Co-operative Societies-cum-
First Appellate Authority.

FA/7/2014

Thiru T. Pravin,
No.25, Kulathu Medu Street,
Thirubuvanai,
Periyapet,
Puducherry – 605 107.

>>>>

Appellant

Vs.

The Public Information Officer,
Pondicherry State Co-operative Housing
Federations Ltd., P. 486,
7th Cross, Thanthai Periyar Nagar,
Puducherry – 605 005.

>>>>

Respondent

ORDER

(Issued under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005)

The aggrieved applicant who is always seeking information on the very same subject on which he has filed innumerable applications and first appeals, is before me with yet another first appeal filed under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter 'the Act'). Here again, the bone of contention and apple of discord is on an employee of the respondent society, Pondicherry State Co-operative Housing Federation.

2. Vide his application dated 20.3.2014, information was sought for from the respondent and it is seen that information was provided to the appellant vide letter dated 2.4.2014. Aggrieved by almost every point of reply he filed this first appeal, the gist and kernel of the appeal, as stood exposted is that :

- (i) The respondent wrongly denied furnishing the copies of certificates of Thiru. Baskar @ Kumaravel;
- (ii) Having said that a resolution was passed to promote him as Collection Supervisor, the respondent now denied that no such resolution was passed;
- (iii) Action taken on the complaint letter given by Thiru. Krubanithi,
- (iv) Duty chart given to Thiru. Baskar @ Kumaravel,
- (v) Action taken on the petition given by Thiru. Balamohan, and
- (vi) Copy of the Co-operative Act and Rules which empower payment of salary to an employee by abuse of power.

3. The appeal was taken on file and the response of the respondent was obtained. A copy of the response filed by the respondent is forwarded to the appellant.

4. On poring over the grounds of appeal and the response filed by the respondent, time and again I find that the appellant is trying to pick holes in whatever information is provided to him. In respect of the first query, there was a typographical error committed by the respondent, i.e., 1.5.2013 was inadvertently given as 1.5.2004. The appellant immediately bounced on the respondent stating that the information sought was suppressed by the respondent. The respondent corrected the typographical error by furnishing the response and stated that no such information was available. Hence, nothing survives on this point.

