

Case No. : SIC/LPR.15/2021
Complainant/ Appellant : Kakoli Debnath
Respondent : SPIO & Deputy Registrar, Gauhati University,
Guwahati
Date of Hearing : 21/10/2021
Complaint/ Second : Dr. A.P.Rout,
Appeal heard by State Chief Information Commissioner, Assam

O R D E R
21/10/2021

1. The petitioner Kakoli Debnath is present. The petitioner has filed her RTI application before the PIO of Gauhati University on 31.03.2021. On non receipt of any information, the petitioner filed 1st appeal before the 1st Appellate Authority of Gauhati University on 12.05.2021.
2. The PIO of Gauhati University then sent a letter to the petitioner on 28.06.2021 wherein the PIO has mentioned that the RTI application was forwarded to the Academic Branch, G.U vide letter no. GU/PIO/RTI/2021/192 dated 21.1.2021 and after that the RTI application was subsequently forwarded to the Head, Deptt. Of English, Gauhati University from the Academic Registrar's end. But no information was received from their end, as the office of Gauhati University was closed due to Covid 19 pandemic w.e.f. 13th May, 2021.
3. The petitioner then filed 2nd appeal before the Chief Information Commission, Delhi which was forwarded to this Commission and accordingly the matter was taken up for hearing.
4. The Public Authority is represented by Dr. Prasanta Barman, Deputy Registrar & PIO, Gauhati University and he is accompanied by Dr. Guruprasad Khatoniar, Academic Registrar, Gauhati University.
5. The PIO of Gauhati University submitted a written statement dated 9.10.2021 which is taken into records.
6. The petitioner verbally intimated that she is satisfied with the information relating to her RTI petition Point No. 6,7,8,9,10,12,13,14,15,17,20,22,24,25,26,27 which is furnished by the Gauhati University and has complaints on other points which are decided as follows:-
 - (a) Decision relating to point no. 1 and 2 – She says that the reply is unsatisfactory and the SPIO is directed to furnish straight reply to the petitioner within 1 month.
 - (b) Decision relating to point no. 3 –The SPIO mentions that the information is available in the link, but the appellant says that full information including those who left PhD courses before completion is not available. A convenient date be fixed and the petitioner be allowed to inspect the documents and only photocopies of relevant information be given.
 - (c) Decision relating to point no. 4 - The SPIO mentions that the reply is available in the link, but the appellant says that full information including those who left PhD courses before completion is not available. A convenient date be fixed and the petitioner be allowed to inspect the documents and only relevant information be given and photocopy of the documents can also be given.
 - (d) Decision relating to point no. 5 – The petitioner says that those who have discontinued or left PhD are removed from PhD Course, the list is there but

the ground of removal or discontinuation is not given. The Commission directs since the names are available, the reason against each of them be furnished within one month.

- (e) Decision relating to point no. 11 – The petitioner intimated that vacant slot with the individual supervisor is not specifically given year wise, which the Commission directs to provide the same within one month.
 - (f) Decision relating to point no. 16 – The petitioner says that there are instances where guides are changed without consent of the existing guide. The information furnished by Gauhati University is not correct. Gauhati University should furnish instances (may be outside English Deptt.) of such cases. The University Authority should provide correct information within one month.
 - (g) Decision relating to point no. 18 – The petitioner intimated that photocopy is devoid of logo, seal etc and are not legible. The content is incorrect. The Commission is not concerned with the correctness of the content. However, she is allowed to inspect the original register and take legible copies as per the convenience of SPIO, Gauhati University. A convenient date be fixed and the whole process should be completed within one month.
 - (h) Decision relating to point no.19 – Reply is given. The role of the Commission is not redressal of the grievances.
 - (i) Decision relating to point no. 21 – The petitioner says that reply is ambiguous and not specific. The Commission orders that if any written communication or and written documents regarding the communication is available, the same be given within one month.
 - (j) Decision relating to point no. 23 – She intimated that no specific reason is given. The Commission feels that this matter is outside the jurisdiction of the Commission.
7. The Commission orders that this whole process should be completed within one month.

Sd/-
(Dr. A.P. Rout)

Authenticated true copy.

Sd/-
Secretary & Registrar
Assam Information Commission

Memo No. SIC/LPR.15/2021

Dtd. 21.10.2021

Copy to:

1. The SPIO, Office of the Registrar, Gauhati University, Gopinath Bardoloi Nagar, Guwahati for information and necessary action.
2. The Academic Registrar, Office of the Academic Registrar, Gauhati University, Gopinath Bardoloi Nagar, Guwahati for information and necessary action.
3. The petitioner Kakoli Debnath, Vill. – Seuj Nagar, P.O. – Khelmati, Dist. – Lakhimpur, State – Assam for information.
4. Computer Section for uploading in the Website.
5. Office File.
6. Order Book.

Secretary & Registrar
Assam Information Commission