



Ashok Kumar Maurya <ashokkumarmaurya9619971441@gmail.com>

Hearing Date: 21/05/2026 , File Number: S11/A/0818/2026 Please consider KOF.

1 message

Ashok Kumar Maurya <ashokkumarmaurya9619971441@gmail.com>

20 May 2026 at 13:14

To: hearingcourts11.upic@up.gov.in

Cc: jansu-section.upic@up.gov.in, deputysecretary-upic@up.gov.in

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION, UTTAR
PRADESH, LUCKNOW****(BENCH: S-11 / HEARING ROOM)****Second Appeal Number: A-20260402111****File Number: S11/A/0818/2026****Hearing Date: 21/05/2026****In the Matter of: Ashok Kumar Maurya ... Appellant****VERSUS 1. State Public Information Officer (SPIO), U.P. Information Commission
(Mumtaz Ahmad)****2. First Appellate Authority (FAA), U.P. Information Commission (Tejaskar Pandey)**

... Respondents

SUBJECT: Detailed written representation by the appellant against the misleading withholding of information under RTI application No. UPICM/R/2026/60103 (dated 18/02/2026), the false scrutiny report by the research officer, and the flawed order passed by the first appellate authority.**Respected Sir/Madam,**

The appellant most respectfully submits the following facts for the kind perusal and consideration of the Hon'ble Commission:

1. Brief Background of the Case

- The appellant had filed a second appeal on **28/12/2025**, registered under appeal number **A-20251202449**.
- On **30/01/2026**, the Research Officer of the Commission, Mr Nigam Bahadur Singh, scrutinised the file and marked its status as "**Applications found deficient**". The remark stated, "*Even after transfer, the first appeal has not been filed before the competent authority.*"
- To ascertain the internal processing and find out how a valid file was held up and incorrectly marked deficient, the appellant filed a 7-point RTI application dated **18/02/2026**.

2. Falsity of the Research Officer's (RO) Scrutiny Report

- The research officer, in his checklist, marked "No" against the attachment of the first appeal copy.
- **The Truth:** The appellant had already filed the mandatory first appeal (**No. DOCMO/A/2025/60213**) on **10/11/2025** regarding the core matter, which was formally disposed of on **03/12/2025**.
- Therefore, the deficiency note dated 30/01/2026 generated by the research officer is completely factually incorrect, groundless, and legally unsustainable.

3. Evasive and Misleading Response by the SPIO

- Under points 2 to 7 of the RTI application, the appellant explicitly requested **certified copies of the Deficiency Note, the Daily Progress Report, the File Movement Register, internal guidelines on holding files, and the specific names/designations of the handling officers.**
- **The SPIO's Action:** SPIO Mumtaz Ahmad, instead of providing the actual copies of the files/registers, merely attached an unrelated, old administrative order dated **13/11/2025** (which details the establishment of a general CRM cell/copying section). For nearly all specific data points, the SPIO evasively wrote—*"As per Point No. 1"*.
- An internal office order regarding a generic customer helpline can never act as a substitute for a dynamic **file movement register** or the **names of the responsible officers**. This constitutes a deliberate withholding of information and a clear violation of Section 7(1) of the RTI Act.

4. Complete Failure of the First Appellate Authority (FAA)

- The First Appellate Authority, Mr Tejaskar Pandey, failed to apply his quasi-judicial mind and mechanically dismissed the appeal on **06/03/2026**, asserting that the SPIO's evasive response was "complete". Not a single actual record requested by the appellant was verified or provided by the FAA.

PRAYERS / RELIEF SOUGHT

In light of the clear documentary evidence and facts stated above, the appellant humbly prays that this honourable bench may be pleased to pass the following orders:

1. **Revocation of the Deficiency Note:** Direct that the flawed and factually incorrect 'Deficiency Note' dated 30/01/2026 issued by Research Officer Mr Nigam Bahadur Singh be **set aside**, and the Appellant's original Second Appeal (A-20251202449) be restored to its original number for a hearing on its merits.
2. **Direction to Supply True Information:** Command the SPIO to immediately supply certified, legible copies of the information requested under **Points 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7** of the RTI application (specifically the extraction of the File Movement Register and specific officer names) free of cost within 7 days.

3. **Initiation of Penalty Proceedings (Section 20(1)):** Initiate strict penal and disciplinary proceedings under **Section 20(1) of the RTI Act** against the SPIO for knowingly supplying misleading, incomplete, and evasive information, and against the concerned branch for logging a false scrutiny report on the Commission's portal.

Date: 21/05/2026

Place: Mirzapur (Uttar Pradesh)

Respectfully Submitted, (Ashok Kumar Maurya)

Appellant

Mobile No: 9619971441

Email: ashokkumar.maurya9619971441@gmail.com