

Appeal Registration No. AAOIN/A/E/26/00200 dated 11.07.2026

I have carefully examined the records, including the RTI application, the reply furnished by the CPIO and the grounds raised in the First Appeal.

At the outset, it is observed that the RTI application bearing Registration No. AAOIN/R/T/24/00333 was disposed of by the CPIO on 09.07.2024, whereas the present First Appeal has been filed on 11.07.2026, nearly **two years** thereafter. The appellant has not furnished any reasons explaining the inordinate delay in preferring the appeal.

It is further observed that the RTI application was received through the RTI Online Portal and the reply was also furnished through the same portal. Therefore, the appellant's contention that no reply was received is not borne out from the records. The CPIO had informed the appellant that the RTI application was a repeat of RTI Registration No. AAOIN/R/X/24/00051, which had already been disposed of on 05.07.2024. For abundant clarity, a copy of the reply dated 05.07.2024 is again enclosed for ready reference.

It has also been observed that the appellant has, in the present appeal, sought several fresh items of information such as year-wise project details, expenditure, contractors, mode of execution, project completion reports, etc., which were not part of the original RTI application. The scope of a first appeal under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act is confined to examining the correctness of the decision of the CPIO on the information originally sought and cannot be enlarged by introducing fresh requests for information at the appellate stage.

In view of the above, **there is an inordinate delay; the allegation that no reply was received is factually incorrect; and the appellant has also sought to enlarge the scope of the original RTI application by raising fresh queries.** There is no infirmity in the action taken by the CPIO.

Accordingly, the First Appeal is **disposed of**.