

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/11/
January 11, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 30.12.2011 Sh. Munnatta
under RTI Act 2005**

Whereas Sh. L. Munnatta, New Mandi, Patel Nagar, Muzaffar Nagar has filed an appeal against the orders of PIO, IIT Delhi dated 19.12. 2011.

The reply of the PIO and the grounds of the appeal have been perused and it is seen that the applicant desires an information as to whether Hon. Supreme Court orders related to relaxation in eligibility marks for OBC candidates are applicable to IIT JEE 2012 or not? He has further desired to know that if it is applicable, why no mention thereof has been made in IIT JEE 2012 Information Brochure?

Joint Entrance Examination is conducted by JEE Cell and the desired information was therefore sought from Chairman, JEE. It has been informed by Chairman, JEE that this information is already printed at Appendix II of Information Brochure. A copy of this Appendix has also been made available by JEE Cell which has already been provided to applicant by PIO vide letter No. IITD/RTI/2011/238/1220 dated 19.12.2011. The Information Brochure under the heading "Rank Lists" details the information sought by the applicant.

As such, no further action is warranted at the level of Appellate Authority since the information sought for has already been provided by the PIO.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Sh. L. Munnatta,
O.F.C.
Telephone Exchange
New Mandi, Patel Nagar,
Muzaffar Nagar
U.P.-251001

Copy to :

PIO

No. IITD/R/AA/11/
January 16, 2012

Shri Shrawan Kumar
405, Kailashpuri
Newr Narendra Bhawan, Lalgah
Bikaner – Rajasthan

Subject : For first appeal under RTI Act.

Dear Sir,

It has a reference to your appeal dated 10-01-2012 under RTI Act 2005..

It has been informed by PIO that the desired information has already been sent to you vide letter No.IITD/RTI/2012/21/1248/240 dated January 6, 2012. However, a copy of the same is enclosed for ready reference.

Yours sincerely,

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar

Encl : as above

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
January 30, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 23.01.2012 of Dr. C.V. Singh
under RTI Act 2005**

Whereas Dr. C.V. Singh, Jr. Tech. Supdt., DMS, IIT Delhi has filed an appeal against the orders of PIO, IIT Delhi dated 23-09-2011..

I have perused the appeal preferred by Dr. C.V. Singh and it is seen that no information has been sought vide this appeal. Giving details of his appointment, leaves earned and contribution made to CPG during the tenure of his service, it has been informed vide this appeal that the Institute has not acceded to his earlier requests to allow him the continuity of service by condoning the break in service for the period from 13th May, 1996 to 23rd December, 1996.

The issues raised are in the nature of grievances and no information has been sought. As such he is advised to take up the issue with the competent authority for redressal of his grievance.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Dr. C.V. Singh
Jr. Tech. Supdt.
DMS, IIT
New Delhi

Copy to :

PIO

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
January 30, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 23.01.2012 of Dr. C.V. Singh
under RTI Act 2005**

Whereas Dr. C.V. Singh, Jr. Tech. Supdt., DMS, IIT Delhi has filed an appeal against the orders of PIO, IIT Delhi dated 19-09-2011..

I have perused the appeal preferred by Dr. C.V. Singh and it is seen that no information has been sought vide this appeal. Giving details of his appointment, leaves earned and contribution made to CPG during the tenure of his service, it has been informed vide this appeal that the Institute has not acceded to his earlier requests for paying gratuity and leave encashment for the period from July 1980 to May 1996.

The issues raised are in the nature of grievances and no information has been sought. As such he is advised to take up the issue with the competent authority for redressal of his grievance.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Dr. C.V. Singh
Jr. Tech. Supdt.
DMS, IIT
New Delhi

Copy to :

PIO

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
January 27, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 23.01.2012 of Dr. C.V. Singh
under RTI Act 2005**

Whereas Dr. C.V. Singh, Jr. Tech. Supdt., DMS, IIT Delhi has filed an appeal against the orders of PIO, IIT Delhi dated 19-09-2012..

I have perused the appeal preferred by Dr. C.V. Singh and it is seen that no information has been sought in this appeal. Giving details of his appointment, leaves earned and contribution made to CPG during the tenure of his service it has been informed vide this appeal that the Institute has not accorded to his earlier requests to allow him the continuity in service by condoning the break in service for the period from 13th May, 1996 to 23rd December, 1996.

It is thus inferred that the issues raised are more in the nature of grievances and not as an information being sought under RTI Act. As such he is advised to take this matter with the competent authority.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Dr. C.V. Singh
Jr. Tech. Supdt.
DMS, IIT
New Delhi

Copy to :

PIO

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
February 1, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 9.11.2011 of Dr. Vishwa Nath
under RTI Act 2005**

Whereas Dr. Vishwa Nath, Principal Scientist, Division of Entomology, I.A.R.I. New Delhi has filed an appeal against the orders of PIO, IIT Delhi dated 11-10-2011..

The applicant has sought information about the name of the staff owning personal car valuing more than Rs.35 lac and the Make, Year of Purchase and Mode of Purchase of such cars. The information has been denied by PIO quoting Section 2(f) of the Act stating that the same does not exist. Aggrieved the applicant has preferred this appeal stating that the information sought for is neither confidential nor covered under section 2 (f) since employees are supposed to declare their immovable and moveable property owned by them as per the provisions of relevant rules.

Having regard to the submissions made by the appellant, D.R. (E-I) and A.R. (E-II) were advised to collect this information from all concerned. It has now been informed by them that none of the employees from their sections own a personal car valuing more than Rs. 35 lac.

It is therefore, informed that none of the staff members of IIT Delhi owns personal car valuing more than Rs. 35 lac.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Dr. Vishwa Nath
Principal Scientist
Division of Entomology
I.A.R.I
New Delhi - 110 012

Copy to :

PIO

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
February 7, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 03.02.2012 of Sh. R.M. Nimje
under RTI Act 2005**

Sh. R.M. Nimje, Plot No. 123, Vithalwadi Hudkeshwar road, Nagpur has filed an appeal dated 3.2.2012 against the orders of PIO, IIT Delhi dated 17.01. 2012.

I have perused the appeal. It is seen that Sh. R.M. Nimje has raised queries which are more in the nature of "explanation" than an "information" within the provisions of RTI Act, 2005. He wants to know as to **why** "hallo sticker" is not pasted on the roll number on the answer sheet and as to **why** a candidate is subjected to personal examination despite obtaining good marks in GATE examination? He further wants to know if it is possible to mark correct choice for question not been attempted by the student? He further seeks an explanation as to **why** this examination is not conducted on line?

Despite the queries not being in the nature of an "information" under the provision of RTI Act, the Public Information Officer has made sincere efforts to explain in detail the process of conducting examination and to satisfy these queries to the extent possible.. It has been informed that out of 21 subject papers, on line examination is conducted for six papers.

Right to Information Act is a provision enabling seeking of available information and not seeking explanations of the public authority or advising it regarding official functioning.

With the above in view, no information can be furnished to the quarries made in the appeal of Sh. R.M. Nimje dated 9.2.2012.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Sh. R.M. Nimje,
Plot No. 123,
Vithalwadi Hudkeshwar Road,
Nagpur - 440034 (Maharashtra)

Copy to :

PIO

No. IITD/R/AA/11/
February 16, 2012

Shri Ravi Kumar
Flat No. 18, Type IV
Kasturba Polytechnic Campus
Pitampura, Delhi – 110088

Subject : Information under RTI Act 2005

Dear Sir,

It has a reference to your appeal dated 14-02-2012 under RTI Act 2005..

In this regard it is to inform that the desired information has already been furnished by PIO vide letter No. RTI/2012/267/07 dated January 20, 2012. This letter was sent through registered post and has been returned undelivered with the remarks that "No such person on this address". You are, therefore, requested to collect the desired information from the office of PIO in person.

Yours sincerely,

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar &
Appellate Authority

Copy to :

PIO

OFFICE OF REGISTRAR & APPELLATE AUTHORITY

No. IITD/R/2012/AA/

Dated: 16-2-2012

Sub.: In the matter related to Appeal dated 6-1-2012 of Sh. Gandharv Makker, Advocate, Delhi High Court under RTI Act 2005

Whereas Sh. Gandharv Makkar, Advocate has filed an Appeal against the orders of PIO vide No. IITD/RTI/2011/233/1250 dated 29-11-2011.

The Applicant has vide his application dated 29-11-11 sought a list of all regular cadre posts that existed in the Institute during the year 1985 alongwith cadre-wise number of sanctioned posts as also the list of common designations between Institute and IRD staff (appointed on projects) as existed in the year 1985. The PIO has declined the information on the grounds that it is more than 25 years old and that no larger public interest is involved.

Aggrieved the applicant has preferred this appeal on the ground that only the information covered by clauses (a), (c) and (i) of sub-section (1) of Section 8 can be declined if it is more than 20 years old and in all other cases the disclosure is mandatory. He has also challenged the ground of withholding this information of no public interest stating that it is to be used to file an Appeal in the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case No. LPA 262/2001 and there cannot be larger public interest if the information helps to serve the Apex Court of the land.

I have discussed the matter in person with Sh. Ram Prasad, A.R. (E-II) and it is informed that the desired information is not available. It is not unbelievable to hold that certain information which is more than 25 years old is not traceable specially keeping in view the nature of information sought. The information sought is about the cadre wise number of posts and the designations that were common both to Institute and IRD staff during 1985. It is further informed that even supporting documents that may help generating this information are not available.

With the above in view the information sought by Sh.Gandharv Makker, Advocate, Delhi High Court cannot be furnished.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar &
Appellate Authority

Sh. Gandharv Makker
Advocate, Delhi High Court
42/8, Central Road, Ashok Nagar
New Delhi-110018

Copy to :

PIO

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY : DELHI
OFFICE OF REGISTRAR & APPELLATE AUTHORITY

No. IITD/R/2012/AA/
Dated: 21-2-2012

Sub.: **In the matter related to Appeal dated 2-2-2012 of Sh. Pradeep Kumar under RTI Act 2005**

Whereas Sh. Pradeep Kumar has filed an Appeal against the orders of PIO vide No. IITD/RTI/2012/241/1192 dated 06-01-2012.

The Applicant Sh. Pradeep Kumar has requested a colour zerox copy of GATE score card submitted along with his application while applying for admission to M.Tech. programme in Building Science & Construction Management in Civil Eng. Dept. of IIT Delhi. PIO has declined the information on the grounds that the matter is more than 10 years old and the personal files of graduating students are not available in PG Section. Aggrieved, Sh. Pradeep Kumar has now sought a copy of the approval note for destroying the case file bearing his name.

I have discussed the matter with Sh. Ashok Kumar, Supdt. And Sh. K.P. Singh, D.R. PGS&R, the custodians of the concerned record and it is informed that the retention period for personal files of the graduating students has been approved by the competent authority as 10 years. In fact, a photocopy of such in principle approval of Director, IIT Delhi has already been made available to the applicant. As such there may not be any requirement for obtaining specific approval for destroying the files bearing names of individual graduating students and hence it may not be possible to provide a copy of the approval note for destroying the case file bearing the name of the applicant.

D.R. (PGS&R) is further advised to make sincere efforts afresh to locate this file from the record room and if traced, send by registered post the original as also colour zerox copy of the GATE score card to the applicant. Needful will be done by 5th March, 2012. In case the file is not traceable in the record room, a communication to this effect may be sent by D.R. (PGS&R) to the applicant.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar &
Appellate Authority

Sh. Pradeep Kumar, IRSE
Sr. Divisional Engineer
Central Divisional Office
South Central Railway
Guntakal – 515 801
Anantapur District,
Andhra Pradesh

Copy to :

1. D.R. (PGS&R)
2. PIO

No.IITD/R/AA/2012/AREG
February 21, 2012

Mr. Balvinder Singh
D-I/A-2, IIT Campus,
Hauz Khas,
New Delhi- 110016

Subject: Your appeal relating your RTI application dated 14-02-2012

Dear Sir,

This is with reference to your appeal relating to your RTI application dated 8.1.2012.

In this regard it is to inform that the desired information has already been furnished by PIO vide letter No. RTI/2012/269/70 dated 14.02.2012, a copy of which is enclosed herewith.

Thanking you,

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar &
Appellate Authority

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
February 24, 2012

Dr. Subiman Kundu
Dept. of Mathematics
IIT Delhi

Subject : Furnishing information under the Right to Information Act 2005

Dear Sir,

It has a reference to your letter dated February 22, 2012. It is to inform that Dr. Anil Sawhney had vide his email dt. 3.12.2010 requested to allow him to join IIT Delhi on 18.7.2011. This request was granted by the Director on the recommendations of the Professorial Committee. Accordingly, Dr. Sawhney was informed vide office letter No. IITD/IES1/U-1/85 dated 10.1.2011 that his request has been considered by the competent authority and it has been decided to extend the joining period upto 18.7.2011.

With the above in view, it is informed that the aforesaid email of Dr. Anil Sawhney was impliedly considered as his acceptance to the offer of appointment to the post of Associate Professor.

With regards,

Yours sincerely,

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar

Copy to :

PIO

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
February 24, 2012

Dr. Subiman Kundu
Dept. of Mathematics
IIT Delhi

Subject : Furnishing information under the Right to Information Act 2005

Dear Sir,

It has a reference to your letter dated February 17, 2012. The desired information is annexed (7 pages).

You have also sought an information as to why Board of Governors could not constitute its panel of nominees well in advance and as to what is the meaning of the word 'dominance' and how this 'order of dominance' was determined. In this regard it is very kindly informed that these queries which are in the nature of an explanation do not comprise an information as defined under Section 2(f) of Right to Information Act. No such explanations are available in the record in any form as has been confirmed from the custodian of the concerned information i.e. Estt.I section. As such it cannot be furnished.

With regards,

Yours sincerely,

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar

Encl : as above

Copy to :

PIO

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
March 22, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 14.03.2012 Dr. Wagish Shukla
under RTI Act 2005**

Whereas Dr. Wagish Shukla, Mathematics Dept., IIT Delhi has filed an appeal against the orders of PIO, IIT Delhi dated 17.02. 2012.

I have perused the appeal. The applicant Dr. Wagish Shukla has raised following issues :

- a) The copies of the relevant documents are though certified but a clear assurance is needed that these are attested true copies.

It has been confirmed from Supdt. E-I that the copies provided are in fact attested true copies of the desired correspondence.

- b) The provided documents do not show as to when letters were received in the intended office after dispatch from Mathematics Dept.

Documents as available in the record have been made available as is the requirement of RTI Act, 2005.

- c) By what time a final decision in the matter is expected by IIT authorities.

It is not an information as defined under RTI Act and the applicant is advised to contact the concerned authorities in this regard.

- d) The applicant has also sought some additional information which is more in the nature of an explanation and does not qualify to be an information under RTI Act. For example he wants to know as to how a particular letter surfaced on the table of the Dy. Director (F).

e) Dr. Wagish Shukla has also sought additional information about the constitution and recommendations of Anomaly Committee. Though no new information can be sought by way of an appeal, keeping in view the ready availability of this document with E-I and the convenience of the applicant minutes of the Anomaly Committee are attached herewith.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Dr. Wagish Shukla
Mathematics Dept.
IIT Delhi

Copy to :

PIO

D.R. (E-I)

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
March 26, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 21.03.2012 of Sh. A.K. Sharma
under RTI Act 2005**

Whereas Sh. A.K. Sharma has filed an appeal stating that PIO has provided information in respect of all other points except the one mentioned in column no.7 of his application dated 13th Feb., 2012.

I have perused the original application and it is seen that the information sought in this column i.e. column no.7 is in the nature of seeking reasons/explanations for some decision of the Institute. Explanations or reasons are not an "information" as defined under RTI Act and as such it cannot be furnished. However, it has been enquired personally from the concerned officials and it is informed that there is no such document furnishing reasons/explanations for such decision of the Institute.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Sh. A.K. Sharma
Flat No. 35, SPA Residential Complex
Taimur Nagar, Opp. 'B' Block,
New Friends Colony
New Delhi – 110065

Copy to :

PIO

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
April 23, 2012

Sh. Himanshu Gera has sought following information in respect of safety NOC provided by the Dept. of Civil Eng. in 2008 to the resident of House No. 2K-65 (Front portion), NIT Faridabad for installation of mobile tower through M/s Wireless – TT Info Services Limited Delhi (A wholly owned company of Tata Teleservices Limited) :

“Whether the site inspection was done prior to providing a certificate”

You are requested to furnish the desired information at your earliest convenience so as to dispose off the reference within the stipulated time.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Satish Kumar
Helper, Works (Elect. Maint.)

Copy to :

1. Sh. Himanshu Gera,
House No. 2K-65, (Back Side)
Near Vidya Niketan School,
NIT Faridabad
Faridabad
Haryana - 121001

Though the reference details provided are not sufficient, efforts are being made to trace the desired information. You have also sought information regarding the basis on which this certificate has been issued neglecting certain important considerations. In this regard it is informed that it does not comprise an information as per provisions of RTI Act.

2. PIO

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
May 4, 2012

Sh. Satish Kumar, Helper, Works (Elect. Maint.) has filed an Appeal since he is not satisfied with the information furnished by the PIO vide his letter dated April 17, 2012. The contents of the Appeal have been perused and the desired information is furnished as under :

- 1) Para No. 2 of the Appeal : As has been informed by Establishment – II Wing, no action in the past has been taken against the General Secretary for having failed to discharge his duties/responsibilities under the constitution of IITEU.
- 2) Para No. 3 of the Appeal : As has been informed by Coordination Section, no such list of committee has been received. The Appellant has also sought information about the approval of any such committee by the Executive Council of the union and the minutes of the meeting of the Executive Council of the Union. This information is not available with IIT Delhi.
- 3) Para No. 5 of the Appeal : The details of letters from union received in the Coordination Section are as follows :
 1. Sub.Issue of Uniform to Gr. D Attendants – D.No. ADIR-1316 recd. On 10-10-2011 sent to DDA.
 2. Sub:Some issues – D.No. ADIR-1421 received on 3-11-2011 – sent to DDA.
 3. Sub: GJ Award for Inst. Employees – ADIR 1594 recd. On 19-12-2011 sent to DDA.
 4. Sub: Revision of OTA – D.No. ADIR-81 recd. On 19-1-2012 – sent to DDA.
 5. Sub: Mapping / Pay Fixation in PB-3 – D.No. ADIR-270 received on 5-3-12 – sent to DDA.
 6. Sub: Agenda for the forthcoming meeting – D.No. ADIR 334 recd. On 21-3-12 – send to DDA.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Sh. Satish Kumar,
Helper,
Works (Elect. Maint.)

Copy to :

PIO

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
May 21, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 28.04.2012 Sh. Rajeev Ranjan Kumar
under RTI Act 2005**

Whereas Sh. Rajeev Ranjan Kumar, Advocate, S-103 A, School Block Shakarpur, Delhi has filed an appeal against the orders of PIO, IIT Delhi dated 18.04.2012.

Sh. Rajeev Ranjan Kumar has sought information about processing of and further necessary action taken by the Institute on a complaint submitted by him vide his letter dated 1/2/2012. Replying thereto, PIO has informed that his letter (complaint) addressed to the Director has not been received in the Institute. Aggrieved, Sh. Rajeev Ranjan Kumar has preferred this appeal providing details of the Indian Speed Post vide which it was sent and the proof of delivery. He has also enclosed an internet speed post tracking report in support of his contention.

With the above in view, Asst. Registrar (CDN) was advised to locate this communication so that the desired information can be furnished at the earliest. He has after inquiring in Director's Office and Coordination Section informed that the letter is not traceable and has probably been misplaced. He has also stated that the applicant may be requested to provide a copy of his earlier letter so that it can be processed expeditiously.

With the above in view Sh. Rajeev Ranjan Kumar, appellant is hereby informed that the letter dated 1/2/2012 sent earlier by him has been misplaced and it is requested to make available a copy thereof to A.R. (CDN) for expeditious processing.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Sh. Rajeev Ranjan Kumar,
Advocate,
S-103 A, School Block Shakarpur,
Delhi - 110 092

Copy to :

PIO

A.R. (CDN)

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
May 22, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 16.04.2012 Sh. Himanshu Gera
under RTI Act 2005**

Whereas Sh. Himanshu Gera has filed an appeal against the orders of PIO, IIT Delhi dated 26-12-2012.

The information was procured from the concerned section i.e. IRD and it is informed that as per IIT records, there is no consultancy job undertaken for M/s Wireless – TT Info Services Ltd., Delhi. Information was subsequently sought from Dept. of Civil Eng. also and it has been informed that as per response received from the faculty, nobody has undertaken this job.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Sh. Himanshu Gera,
House No. 2K-65, (Back Side)
Near Vidya Niketan School,
NIT Faridabad
Faridabad
Haryana – 121001

Copy to :

PIO

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
June 11, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 1.6.2012 of Sh. S. Babu
under RTI Act 2005**

Whereas Sh. S. Babu has vide his appeal dated 1.6.2012 preferred an appeal under RTI Act as he is not 'happy' with the reply (information) he has received from PIO.

I have perused the contents of the appeal and it is seen that no information has been sought by this appeal. As such no information need to be furnished.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Sh. S. Babu
D-2/B-2, IIT Campus
Hauz Khas,
New Delhi

Copy to :

PIO, RTI Cell

OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

(UNDER RTI ACT 2005) IIT : DELHI

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
June 13, 2012

In the matter related to appeal dated 23.5.2012 of Sh. S. Babu under RTI Act 2005

Whereas Sh. Balvinder Singh has vide his appeal dated 23.5.2012 preferred an appeal under RTI Act.

I have perused the contents of the appeal and it is seen that he is not satisfied with the information provided by Public Information Officer in response to his queries at sr. no. 1 & 2 of his original application dated 8-1-2012. Detailed information has been sought from the concerned section i.e. Estt. II and it is informed that issues raised by Sh. Balvinder Singh in his applications dated 25-10-2011 and 28-9-2011 were same as were raised in his application dated 8-1-2012. As such earlier applications were not dealt with separately. However, a copy of the note sheet where his application dated 25-10-2011 was dealt is enclosed.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Sh. Balvinder Singh
D-1/A-2, IIT Campus
Hauz Khas,
New Delhi

Copy to :

PIO, RTI Cell

No. IITD/R/12/

June 18, 2012

Dear Sh. Rajeev,

Kindly refer to your letter dated 7-6-2012 received in this office on 11-6-2012. It is also to acknowledge the receipt of your earlier communication dated 1-2-2012 as an attachment to this letter.

Your letter was forwarded to A.R. (CDN) who has now informed that your letter dated 1-2-2012 which was addressed to C&AG, Govt. of India with a copy to Chairman JEE, Director IIT and others was actually received in Coordination Section on 3-2-2012 and forwarded by him to Director's Office on the same day. A.R. (CDN) has also informed that it could not be traced earlier since the subject matter was not mentioned in your application and only the reference of speed post was given. It is further informed that a communication in this regard was later received from the office of C&AG also and a parawise reply was sent by Chairman JEE to Audit Section. PIO has also been advised to furnish any other information sought by you.

Yours sincerely,

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar

Sh. Rajeev Ranjan Kumar,
Advocate,
S-103 A, School Block Shakarpur,
Delhi - 110 092

Copy to :

PIO, RTI Cell : Along with a copy of letter dated 7-6-2012 bearing on the face of it the observations of A.R. (CDN). Any other information sought by the applicant may also please be furnished.

Dear Sh. Khurana Ji,

Whereas you have vide your letter dated 2.5.2012 preferred an appeal under RTI Act against the orders of PIO dated 4-4-2012.

I have perused your application dated 7-3-2012 seeking certain information and the replies furnished by PIO vide his letter dated 4-4-2012. It is felt that the information sought for has been made available by PIO as was available with concerned section. Vide above referred appeal you have observed that the information furnished is "incomplete, unfactual, distorted, originally concealed and contradictory". I have discussed the issues raised by you in this appeal with all concerned and it is informed that information available with the Institute has been furnished. However, since you are stationed in IIT Campus only, you are welcome to meet the undersigned during office hours on any working day so that the information being sought by you can be properly understood and furnished.

Yours sincerely,

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Sh. S.P. Khurana
C-4/A-1, IIT Campus
Hauz Khas,
New Delhi

Copy to :

PIO, RTI Cell

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
July 4, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 25.06.2012 Sh. D. Jayabalachandran
under RTI Act 2005**

Whereas Sh. D. Jayabalachandran, Dy. Registrar, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University has filed an appeal against the orders of PIO, IIT Delhi dated 13-6--2012.

I have perused the appeal and related documents and it is made out that the appellant has vide this appeal not sought any "information" as is defined under relevant provisions of RTI Act, 2005. He has raised his grievances on the decision of IIT Delhi to encash his EL and HPL rather than transferring these to Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University.

Right to Information Act is not a provision for seeking redressal of grievances. Since no specific information has been sought by the appellant, it cannot be furnished. However, the applicant is advised to take up his case with appropriate authority of IIT Delhi.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Sh. D. Jayabalachandran,
Dy. Registrar,
Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University
(A Central University), Vidya Vihar,
Raebareli Road, Lucknow – 226025

Copy to :

PIO

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
July 3, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 22.06.2012 Sh. Sadanand Pal
under RTI Act 2005**

Whereas Sh. Sadanand Pal has filed an application dated 25-5-2012 under RTI Act seeking some information related to IIT JEE which has been made available to him by PIO, IIT Delhi vide letter No. IIT/RTI/2012/64/448 dated 11-6--2012. Not satisfied with the information furnished by PIO, the appellant has made an appeal dated 2-6-2012.

I have perused the appeal and it is seen that expressing surprise over scoring of 385 marks out of a total of 400 marks in JEE 2012 by a candidate named Sh. Arpit Agarwal, The appellant has sought comments of Indian Institute Technology Delhi about the role of coaching institutions towards success in IIT JEE 2012. The PIO has rightly denied this information stating that it is not available.

In fact no such information can be available since it is in the nature of an opinion. Further, RTI 2005 is not a provision to seek opinion or views of the public authority on certain issues of private or public concern. As such the denial of this information by PIO holding that no such information is available is justified and upheld.

The applicant has also sought some information about the question wise evaluation of a particular registration number and the number of chances a student can avail while writing IIT JEE. Reply to both these questions as furnished by PIO is in order.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Sh. Sadanand Pal
Village & Post, Nawabganj
Via – Manihari
Jilla Katih
Bihar – 854 113

Copy to :

PIO

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
July 3, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 26.06.2012 Sh. D. Jayabalachandran
under RTI Act 2005**

Whereas Sh. D. Jayabalachandran, Dy. Registrar, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University has filed an appeal against the orders of PIO, IIT Delhi dated 13-6--2012.

I have perused the appeal and related documents and earlier correspondence on the subject. The only specific information sought by the applicant is regarding crediting of an amount of Rs.36765/- towards GIS to his account. The PIO has vide his letter dated 13-6-2012 informed that the said amount has been credited to his Canara Bank account on 3-4-2007. In fact he has also made available a copy of account ledger page of his account. However, the appellant has now vide this appeal pointed out that the crediting of this amount to his saving account No. 56972 of Canara Bank was irregular and it should rather have been paid to him by cheque/demand draft. He has sought explanation for crediting this amount to his saving account.

Right to Information Act is not a provision for seeking justification/explanation of actions or to seek redressal of the grievances. As such no information can be furnished to the appellant and he is advised to take up the matter with the appropriate authority of IIT Delhi.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Sh. D. Jayabalachandran,
Dy. Registrar,
Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University
(A Central University), Vidya Vihar,
Raebareli Road, Lucknow – 226025

Copy to :

PIO

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
July 6, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 29.06.2012 Sh. Siddhartha Ghosh
under RTI Act 2005**

Whereas Sh. Siddhartha Ghosh has filed an appeal against the orders of PIO, IIT Delhi dated 6-6-2012.

I have perused the appeal and related documents. It is seen that the appellant Sh. Siddhartha Ghosh has earlier sought some information regarding selection process of NTPC sponsored two years M.Tech. programme in IIT Delhi for the year 2006. Related information, as was available with the dept., has already been made available to him by PIO vide letter dated 6-6-2012. The concerned Head of Dept. has clearly stated that they do not have any more information on this issue.

The appellant has now contended that he has been provided information only about successful candidates which was already known to him. It is also stated in his appeal that NTPC has informed him of two possible reasons of rejection and through this appeal he wants to know that out of these two reasons, which one is correct.

Since the available information has already been made available and keeping in view that RTI is not a provision to seek reasons/justifications for a decision taken by public authority, no additional information can be made available to the appellant.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Sh. Siddhartha Ghosh
c/o Jayanta Basu Roy
Club Road (Behind S.B.I. Main Branch)
Jalpaiguri – 735101
West Bengal

Copy to :

PIO

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
July 6, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 2.05.2012 of Sh. S.P. Khurana
under RTI Act 2005**

It has a reference to information furnished by your office to PIO vide your letter No. IW08/260 dated 20-3-2012.

Aggrieved by the information furnished by PIO, the appellant has preferred an appeal. He was invited for personal interaction to understand as to what is the actual requirement and based on interaction it was observed as under :

- i) At serial no. 6 of his application Sh. S.P. Khurana has sought information about the full details of the allottees of all shops. The same be furnished immediately. The information sought at another place regarding items allowed to be sold by each allottee may also be incorporated in these details.
- ii) It has been informed that no shop has been allotted without tender. However, Sh. Khurana brought to my specific notice that some shops have been allotted without tender which may kindly be confirmed.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Estate Officer

Copy to :

Institute Engineer

PIO

Sh. S.P. Khurana
C-4/A-1, IIT campus
IIT, Hauz Khas,
New Delhi - 110016

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
July 6, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 2.05.2012 of Sh. S.P. Khurana
under RTI Act 2005**

The following information has been sought by Sh. S.P. Khurana :

“The policy and system of appointment with authorities to the allottee of the
shops.”

It may kindly be furnished at the earliest.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

A.R. (CDN)

Copy to :

PIO

Sh. S.P. Khurana
C-4/A-1, IIT campus
IIT, Hauz Khas,
New Delhi - 110016

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
August 1, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 19.6.2012 of Sh. S. Babu
under RTI Act 2005**

Whereas Sh. S. Babu has vide his appeal dated 19.6.2012 preferred an appeal under RTI Act It is seen that appeal in this matter has been filed earlier also on 1-6-2012 which has been replied to vide No. IITD/R/AA/12/AREG/955 dated June 11, 2012. However, the appellant has filed another appeal.

Having perused the contents of the appeal, it is seen that the queries raised are in the nature of whether and when etc. He wants to know whether or not his case for stepping up will be considered and if so, how many years it will take to dispose it off.

Though such queries cannot be replied under RTI Act since no such information exists. However, A.R. of concerned section (E-II) is advised to ensure the speediest disposal of this case. He is also requested to call Sh. S. Babu who stays in IIT campus and apprise him the status of the case in person.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Sh. S. Babu
D-2/B-2, IIT Campus
Hauz Khas,
New Delhi

Copy to :

A.R. (E-II)

PIO, RTI Cell

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
August 13, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 2.05.2012 of Sh. S.P. Khurana
under RTI Act 2005**

It has a reference to our telephonic discussions. Certain additional information sought by you as made available by Estate Office is as under :

Allotment of shops are dealt with by Estate Office as well as by Dean of Students. The list of shops allotted by Estate Office is at **Annexure A.** and those allotted by Dean of Students is at **Annexure B.**

I hope it meets your requirement.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Sh. S.P. Khurana
C-4/A-1, IIT campus
IIT, Hauz Khas,
New Delhi - 110016

Copy to :

PIO

No. IITD/R/12/
August 13, 2012

Subject : In the matter related to appeal dated 2.05.2012 of Sh. S.P. Khurana under RTI Act 2005

Dear Sh. Khurana Ji,

It has a reference to our telephonic discussions. Certain additional information sought by you as made available by Estate Office is as under :

Allotment of shops are dealt with by Estate Office as well as by Dean of Students. The list of shops allotted by Estate Office is at **Annexure A**. and those allotted by Dean of Students is at **Annexure B**.

I hope it meets your requirement.

Thanking you,

Yours sincerely,

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Sh. S.P. Khurana
C-4/A-1, IIT Campus
Hauz Khas,
New Delhi

Copy to :

PIO, RTI Cell

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
September 24, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 8.9.2012 of Sh. Mahendra Pratap Singh
under RTI Act 2005**

Whereas Sh. Mahendra Pratap Singh has preferred an application under RTI Act, 2005 dated 13-7-2012 to the Prime Minister's Office seeking information regarding category wise representation of teaching and non teaching posts. The application has been transferred under Section 6 (3) of Right to Information Act to Dept. of Higher Education, MHRD vide letter dated 18-7-2012 and subsequently by MHRD to IIT vide letter dated 2-7- 2012.

Reply to said information has been furnished by PIO, IIT Delhi vide his letter dated 30-8-2012. However, not satisfied with the information furnished by PIO, the applicant has preferred this appeal dated 8-9-2012.

I have perused the original application, the information furnished earlier by PIO and the issues raised in this appeal. The appellant has objected to non-furnishing of category wise (sanctioned, existing and vacant posts) numbers of the teaching staff (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor and others) in the proforma made available by him in his original application. He has also objected to non-furnishing of such information in respect to Group A, B, C & D employees in the proforma made available by him in his original application.

As regard information related to faculty, I have discussed the matter in details with Dy. Registrar of concerned section i.e. Estt. I and it is informed that existing sanctioned strength of faculty is 578. Further there is no sanctioned split of these vacancies amongst various positions viz. Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Professor and IIT Delhi has a flexibility in this regard. The status of SC/ST/OBC faculty members on roll of the institute is as under :

Faculty Posts

	SC	ST	OBC
Assistant Professor	1	0	5

Other Posts

Dy. Librarian	0	0	1
Assistant Librarian	1	0	1
Sr. Programmer	1	0	0

Estt. I Section has also made available a copy of MHRD letter dated 9th June, 2008 conveying the guidelines to implement reservation for SC/ST/OBC in recruitment of faculty posts in IITs. A copy of this letter is also enclosed herewith as **Annexure I**.

So far as information related to non teaching staff is concerned, it is seen that the information provided by PIO earlier meets the requirement of the applicant. The Right to Information Act does not mandate the information to be furnished in a proforma specifically designed by the applicant till the time it meets the requirement of the applicant.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Sh. Mahendra Pratap Singh
s/o Sh. Radhey Shyam
B.90 Alok Nagar Dibiyapur Auraiya (UP)

Copy to :

1. PIO
2. D.R. (E-I) : The information is as made available on the note sheet dated 13-9-2012 approved by the Dean (Faculty) on 14-9-2012

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
December 11, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 29.11.2012 of Sh. Kanti Prasad
under RTI Act 2005**

Whereas Sh. Kanti Prasad has filed an application dated 15th Oct., 2012 under RTI Act seeking some information which has already been made available to him by PIO, IIT Delhi vide letter No. IIT/RTI/2012/196/954 dated 20th November, 2012. Not satisfied with the reply furnished by PIO, the appellant has sought point wise reply to the information sought by him vide his original application dt. 15-10-2012 by PIO refers).

I have perused the original application and it is seen that the information sought by Sh. Kanti Prasad vide paras 4 (c) to 4 (g) do not comprise an information under Right to Information Act. Vide these paras, the appellant has sought the following information:

- Justification for linking project post salary with last pay drawn, DA & pension.
- Justification for not revising the salary on the commencement of third year service.
- Justification for the statement "it was not a re-employment as he is stating".
- Justification for continuing to apply the CCS rules for pay fixation of superannuated persons on contract in IIT Delhi.
- Justification for not revising his salary in accordance with the recommendations of Prof. Kandpal Committee

The information sought is more in the nature of justifications for various actions/decisions of the institute taken from time to time and neither these comprise an information nor any documents relating to these exist. However, the entire service record of the applicant has already been made available by PIO vide his letter dated 20th Nov., 2012

However, the following specific information sought for by the applicant have not been made available by PIO :

- i) Sought vide para 4 (b) i.e. a copy of all the representations made by him demanding pay fixation by CCS rules and IRD's reply thereto communicating the decision of "Not Agreed to" on his original application.
- ii) Sought vide para 4 (h) i.e. , a copy of the communication exchanged between IRD Unit and Prof. Kandpal Committee by PIO.

. It is hereby directed that this information should be made available by PIO to the appellant Sh. Kanti Prasad at the earliest.

..

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

PIO, RTI Cell
Copy to :

1. A.R. (IRD) : The information furnished by you earlier was incomplete. Kindly take note that once PIO has advised you to furnish the desired information, you get vested with the responsibilities of a PIO. It is, therefore, advised to be more careful in future while furnishing the desired information failing which you are rendering yourself liable for penal actions as per provisions of RTI.
2. Sh. Kanti Prasad
D-104,
Seema Apartments
Plot No. 7, Sector XI,
Dwarka,
New Delhi - 110075

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
December 5, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 11.9.2012 of Sh. Kanti Prasad
under RTI Act 2005**

Whereas the applicant Sh. Jai Bhagwan Jatav has sought certain information in paras 3 (i), (ii), (iii) & (iv) of his application dated 17-7-2012 from the Minister of HRD. Desired information in respect of information sought at para no. 3 (i), (ii) & (iv) was furnished by CPIO of MHRD vide his letter dated 20th July, 2012. However, for information sought at para no. 3 (iii), the application was transferred under Section 6 (3) of RTI Act 2005 to CPIO, IIT Delhi since IIT Delhi is the organizing chairman of JEE 2012. This information has subsequently been made available by CPIO, IIT Delhi vide his letter dated 13th August, 2012 as furnished by Chairman of JEE.

I have perused the appeal and it is seen that no specific discrepancies in the earlier information furnished by CPIO, IIT Delhi have been pointed out. He has, however stated that there is no indication that before furnishing replies, these have been approved by the Minister of Human Resource Development. On this ground only, he has alleged the reply of CPIO to be evasive, incomplete and unsatisfactory.

Since the appeal does not raise any specific issue related to the discrepancies/shortcomings in the information furnished earlier, no information can be furnished. I have, however also perused the information sought and furnished earlier and it is observed that information sought by the appellant has already been furnished in its entirety and nothing remains to be furnished.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

**OFFICE OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(UNDER RTI ACT 2005)
IIT : DELHI**

No. IITD/R/AA/12/
December 18, 2012

**In the matter related to appeal dated 27.11.2012 of Sh. C. Annamalai
under RTI Act 2005**

Whereas Sh. C. Annamalai has filed an application dated 22-10-2012 seeking some information under RTI Act which has been made available to him by PIO, IIT Delhi vide email dated 22-11--2012. Not satisfied with the information furnished by PIO, he has preferred an appeal dated 27-11-2012.

I have perused the appeal preferred by Sh. Annamalai. It is observed that the information sought is as to how did the PIO answer a particular question while furnishing earlier information. The queries in the nature of how will not comprise an information unless there is a document available regarding that. In the instant case, no such document furnishing the reply to the query 'how' is available. As such the information sought by Sh. Annamalai vide his appeal dated 27-11-2012 cannot be furnished being not available.

(Dr. Rakesh Kumar)
Registrar & Appellate Authority

Sh.C. Annamalai
(annaiitar@gmail.com)

Copy to :

PIO

**vihy izkf/kdj.k dk;kZy;
(vkj-Vh-vkbZ- vf/kfu;e 2005 ds vUrZxr)
Hkk-izkS-la- % fnYyh**

Dzekad% vkbZ vkbZ Vh Mh@dq0@12@
fnukad 6@7@2012

**vkj-Vh-vkbZ- vf/kfu;e 2005 ds vUrZxr Jh InkuUn iky fnuakd 22-6-
2012 dh vihy ds laca/k esaA**

tSlk fd Jh InkuUn iky us vkj-Vh-vkbZ- vf/kfu;e ds rgr 25-5-2012 dks ntZ vkosnu i= esa Hkk-izkS-la-] ts-bZ-bZ- ls lacaf/kr dqN lwpuk ekaxh Fkh] tks tu lwpuk vf/kdkjh] Hkk-izkS-la- fnYyh ds i= la[;k% IIT/RTI/2012/64/448 fnuakd 11-6-2012 ds }kjk miyC/k djkbZ xbZ FkhA tu lwpuk vf/kdkjh }kjk nh xbZ lwpuk ls larq'V u gksus ij vihykFkhZ }kjk fnuakd 22-6-2012 dks vihy dh xbZA

eSaus vihy dk voyksdu fd;k gS vkSj ;g ik;k fd vfiZr vxzoky uke ds izR;k"kh }kjk ts-bZ-bZ- 2012 esa dqy 400 vadksa esa ls 385 vad izklr djus ls vk"p;Z O;Dr djrs gq;s] vihykFkhZ us Hkk-izkS-la-] ts-bZ-bZ- 2012 esa IQyrk ds fy, dksfpax laLFkkuksa dh Hkwfedk ds ckjs esa Hkkjrh; izkS|ksfxdh laLFkku fnYyh dh fvli.kh ekaxh gSA tu lwpuk vf/kdkjh us Li'V :lk ls bl lwpuk dks bUkdj fd;k gS] ;g crkrs gq, fd ;g lwpuk miyC/k ugha gSA

okLro esa bl izdkj dh dksbZ tkudkj miyC/k ugha gks ldrh] pwafd ;g ,d jk; ds nk;js esa (nature of an opinion) gSA vkxs] vkj-Vh-vkbZ- 2005 esa futh vFkok tu lacaf/kr fu"pr eqn~nksa ij tu&izkf/kdj.k ds er vFkok fopkj ekaxs tkus dk izko/kku ugha gSA bl izdkj tu lwpuk vf/kdkjh dks bl lwpuk ls budkj djus dk vf/kdkj gS] D;ksafd bl rjg dh dksbZ mfpr ,oa oS/k lwpuk miyC/k ugha gSA

vkosnd ,d fo"ks'k iathdj.k la[;k ds iz"uokj (question wise) ewY;kadu ds ckjs esa rFkk Hkk-izkS-la-] ts-bZ-bZ- fyf[kr ijh{kk nsus ds volj dh la[;k ds ckjs esa Hkh lwpuk pkgrk gSA tu lwpuk vf/kdkjh }kjk bu nksuksa iz"uksa ds izY;qj Bhd izdkj ls fn, x, gSaA

(MkW- jkds"k

dqekj)

dqylfpo ,oa vihy izkf/kdj.k

Jh InkuUn iky
Xkzke ,oa iksLV] uokcxat
ok;k & e.khgkj
ftyk dfVgj

fcgkj & 854113