



Archana Dubey <archanadubeymzp1995@gmail.com>

Hearing date: 19/05/2026 File Number: S08/A/0774/2026

1 message

Archana Dubey <archanadubeymzp1995@gmail.com>

Tue, May 19, 2026 at 7:30 AM

To: hearingcourts8.upic@up.gov.in

Cc: asp-op.mi@up.gov.in, co-city.mi@up.gov.in, spmzr-up@nic.in, webmaster-upic@up.gov.in

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE UTTAR PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION,
LUCKNOW****In the Matter of:****Appeal Registration Number: A-20260401256 File Number: S08/A/0774/2026**

Smt Archana Dubey W/o [Husband's Name / Optional], R/o Ghode Shahid Ghurahu Patti (Ramai Patti), Thana Kotwali City, District – Mirzapur, Uttar Pradesh – 231001
... APPELLANT

VERSUS

1. **Shri Raj Kumar Meena, ASP** Public Information Officer (PIO), Office of the Superintendent of Police, District – Mirzapur, Uttar Pradesh – 231001
2. **Smt Aparna Rajat Kaushik, SP** First Appellate Authority (FAA), Office of the Superintendent of Police, District – Mirzapur, Uttar Pradesh – 231001 ...
RESPONDENTS

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT**MAY IT PLEASE THE HONOURABLE COMMISSION:**

The appellant respectfully submits as under:

1. PRELIMINARY FACTS & TIMELINE

- **1.1 Submission of Section 6(1) Application:** The Appellant filed an online RTI application on **28/01/2026** seeking specific records regarding the implementation of the Uttar Pradesh Human Rights Commission (UPSHRC) Order dated 29/12/2025 (Case No. 28286/24/55/2025).

- **1.2 Deficient Reply by the PIO:** The Respondent No. 1 (PIO) provided a highly incomplete and evasive reply on **27/02/2026**. Instead of addressing the distinct, point-wise queries, the PIO merely attached a generic inquiry report, failing to provide specific statutory records.

□

- **1.3 Failure of First Appellate Review:** Aggrieved by the PIO's response, the appellant preferred a first appeal under Section 19(1) on **07/03/2026**. However, the Respondent No. 2 (FAA) failed to apply an independent judicial mind and mechanically upheld the PIO's deficient reply via an order dated **03/04/2026**.

□

2. POINT-WISE REBUTTAL OF THE DEFICIENCIES IN INFORMATION

The appellant emphasises that the information requested directly affects accountability and human rights compliance, yet it has been deliberately suppressed by the respondents:

- **Regarding Point A (Action Taken Report to UPSHRC):** The PIO failed to provide a certified copy of the actual correspondence or official compliance report dispatched by the SP Mirzapur to the UPSHRC. Merely handing over internal summaries does not satisfy the request for the specific certified correspondence.

□

- **Regarding Point B (Daily Progress Noting-Sheets / Nasti):** The Appellant specifically requested the day-to-day progress/movement sheets after the receipt of the SHRC order. The PIO completely withheld these records, which is a direct violation of Section 2(j) of the RTI Act defining the right to access file notings.

□

- **Regarding Point C (Seizure Memo of CCTV DVR):** The PIO remained silent on whether the critical evidence (CCTV DVR) was formally seized under a seizure memo. No copy of a seizure memo, nor any legally recorded justification for the non-seizure of this evidence, was made available.

□

- **Regarding Point D (Details of Assigned Officers & Statements):** The identities and designations of the officers directed by the SHRC to associate with the complainant were suppressed. Furthermore, the official dates on which the statements were recorded were entirely omitted.

□

- **Regarding Point E (Internal Compliance Directives):** The certified copy of the direct command/order issued by the SP Mirzapur to the SHO Kotwali

City/Fataha Chowki was explicitly requested but not provided.

—

3. GROUND FOR IMPOSITION OF PENALTY UNDER SECTION 20

- **3.1 Deliberate Obstruction:** The text of the RTI application shows that the queries were clear, precise, and structured. The PIO's action of providing an unrelated or incomplete inquiry report demonstrates a clear intent to mislead the appellant and cover up procedural lacunae.

—

- **3.2 Mechanical Dismissal by FAA:** The FAA bypassed its statutory duty to rectify the PIO's errors, rendering the first layer of appeal entirely redundant and forcing the appellant into protracted litigation before this commission.

—

4. PRAYER / RELIEF SOUGHT

In light of the facts and statutory violations detailed above, the appellant respectfully prays that this honourable commission may be pleased to:

- A. Direct the PIO to immediately provide complete, clear, itemised, and **certified photocopies** of the records sought under Points A, B, C, D, and E of the original RTI application free of cost.
-
- B. Initiate penalty proceedings under Section 20(1) of the RTI Act against Respondent No. 1 (PIO) for wilfully providing a misleading, incomplete, and evasive reply.
-
- **C. Recommend disciplinary action under Section 20(2)** against the concerned officials for persistent non-compliance with transparency guidelines and human rights directives.
 - D. Pass any other order that this Hon'ble Commission deems fit in the interest of justice, transparency, and accountability.
-

Verification: I, Archana Dubey, do hereby declare and verify that the contents of paragraphs 1 to 4 are true and correct to the best of my personal knowledge and belief, derived from official case records, and nothing material has been concealed therefrom.

—

Place: Mirzapur

Date: 19/05/2026

(Smt. Archana Dubey)

Appellant