



Yadav indra <yadavindramzp9118@gmail.com>

Written Submission by Appellant for Hearing on 16/07/2026 - File No: S10/A/1469/2024 (Registration: A-20241001256)

1 message

Yadav indra <yadavindramzp9118@gmail.com>

15 July 2026 at 22:34

To: RAKESH KUMAR <hearingcourts10.upic@up.gov.in>

Cc: Prayagraj Nagar Nigam <nsa.nagarnigam@gmail.com>, osnagarnigam <osnagarnigam@rediffmail.com>

WRITTEN SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT**BEFORE THE HONOURABLE STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION, UTTAR PRADESH****AT LUCKNOW****In the Matter of:****Appeal Registration Number: A-20241001256****File Number: S10/A/1469/2024****Hearing Room: S-10****Indradev Yadav***(S/o Shri Khattan Yadav, R/o Gram & Post Chilh, District Mirzapur, U.P.)***... APPELLANT****VERSUS****Public Information Officer (PIO)***(Office of the Municipal Health Officer, Nagar Nigam Prayagraj, Pin: 211001)***... RESPONDENT****MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH:**

The Appellant humbly submits the following facts and objections for the kind consideration of this Honourable Commission during the ongoing second appeal proceedings:

1. Brief Background of the Case

- The Appellant filed an online RTI application seeking four specific points of information regarding the appointment, postings, and credential verification of Shri Umesh Kumar Singh (S/o Late Lal Bahadur Singh), who joined as a Safai Karmachari at Nagar Nigam Prayagraj in August 2008.
- While the Respondent department confirmed the appointment date as 31 July 2008 and the joining date as 18 August 2008, they have repeatedly provided

evasive, incomplete, and misleading replies regarding the actual operational details of this appointment.

2. Point-Wise Objections to the Misleading Information Provided by the PIO

A. Point 2: Deliberate Concealment of Original Posting (Ward and Zone)

- **Information Sought:** The Appellant explicitly requested the first posting details of Shri Umesh Kumar Singh.
- **PIO's Default:** The PIO merely provided the basic designation "Safai Karmachari".
- **Objection:** The Respondent has intentionally concealed the specific Ward and Zone where the department deployed the employee in August 2008. Providing a designation without the specific operational location is a deliberate attempt to hide vital posting records.

B. Point 4: False and Misleading Identification of the Verifying Authority

- **Information Sought:** The Appellant requested the specific name and designation of the administrative staff or clerk in the Establishment Department (Adhishthan) who physically processed and verified the original educational (High School, Intermediate) and caste/residence certificates of the candidate in August 2008.
- **PIO's Default:** The PIO falsely identified the **Municipal Commissioner (Nagar Ayukt)** as the verifying authority.
- **Objection:** As per established administrative protocols, the Municipal Commissioner is the Appointing Authority who merely monitors and signs off on appointments; the Commissioner does not personally perform ground-level certificate verifications. The PIO has fabricated this response to shield the actual dealing assistants and clerks who processed these files in August 2008.

3. Absolute Non-Compliance in Light of the Current Hearing

- **No Information Provided Till Date:** In view of the current hearing, the PIO has failed to supply any of the specific, complete, and correct information sought by the Appellant.
- **Failure to Use Registered Email:** Although the Appellant's registered email address on the commission's portal is yadavindramzp9118@gmail.com, the PIO has completely ignored this digital channel. They did not send any notice, departmental clarification, or compliance report to this registered email, violating the principles of swift information delivery.
- **Chronic Delays in Postal Services:** In past instances, the PIO dispatched responses extremely late (e.g., dispatching physical letters via Speed Post

EU855986837IN which arrived only on 20 February 2026, well after scheduled commission deadlines). For the current hearing, they have completely failed to act, leaving the Appellant entirely without the required disclosures.

4. Prayer for Relief

In light of the persistent non-compliance, misleading submissions, and deliberate attempts to block transparency, the Appellant most respectfully prays that this Honourable Commission may be pleased to:

1. **Direct the Respondent PIO** to immediately provide the specific **Original Ward and Zone** where Umesh Kumar Singh was first posted in August 2008.
2. **Direct the Respondent PIO** to identify and provide the specific **Name and Designation of the administrative clerk/staff** in the Establishment Department who performed the physical verification of the employee's certificates in 2008.
3. **Impose a Maximum Penalty** on the PIO under **Section 20(1) of the RTI Act, 2005**, for continuously delaying, withholding, and supplying false, incomplete, and misleading information without any reasonable cause.
4. **Recommend Disciplinary Action** against the PIO under **Section 20(2) of the RTI Act, 2005**, for persistent administrative negligence.

For which the Appellant shall ever pray.

Date: 16/07/2026

Place: Mirzapur, Uttar Pradesh

Yours Faithfully,

Indradev Yadav

Appellant

Mobile: 9118208936

Email: yadavindramzp9118@gmail.com