

# RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT, 2005

ANNEXURE-A  
[SEE RULE 6 (1)]  
Format of Application form under  
The Right to Information Rules, 2005

DATE: 08<sup>th</sup> JUNE, 2019


TO:

**PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER**  
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER  
MINISTRY OF FINANCE [DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE]  
14, HUDCO, VASHALA BUILDING, B-WING  
6<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR, BHIKAJI CAMA PLACE  
NEW DELHI – 110006

1.Full name of the Applicant	JAYANTA KUMAR NAYAK 87 SINDHU, FLAT NO.6, 1 <sup>ST</sup> FLOOR, MARINE DRIVE, MUMBAI.400 002
2.Address	AS ABOVE I.D. ENCLOSED
3.Particulars of Information required	<p>PLEASE ANSWER / PROVIDE INFORMATION FOR MY RTI, POINT WISE WITH STATING MY POINTS AND YOUR ANSWER / INFORMATION BELOW IT, FOR CONVENIENCE PURPOSE:</p> <p><b>1. PLEASE INFORM NAMES OF THE:-</b></p> <p><b>A. CHIEF COMMISSIONER</b></p> <p><b>B. COMMISSIONER</b></p> <p><b>C. DEPUTY COMMISSIONER</b></p> <p><b>D. ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER</b></p> <p>SITTING AT ABOVE ADDRESS.</p> <p><b>1. A. PLEASE INFORM NAME OF THE OFFICER WHO IS LOOKING AFTER REVISION APPLICATION GIVING HIERARCHY OF OFFICERS ATTENDING.</b></p> <p><b>2. PLEASE INFORM IN LAST THREE MONTHS HOW MANY REVISION APPLICATIONS HAVE BEEN DISPOSED.</b></p> <p><b>2. A. PLEASE INFORM HOW MANY REVISION APPLICATIONS ARE PENDING FOR DISPOSAL.</b></p>

	<p><b>3. I AM ENCLOSING BLANK INDIAN POSTAL ORDER FOR RS. 10/- ENABLING YOUR DEPARTMENT TO FILL THE CORRECT NAME UNDER WHICH IPO IS REQUIRED WHICH KINDLY DO.</b></p> <p><b>3. A. I AM REQUESTING FOR INFORMATION AS IT EXIST AND DO NOT TREAT MY RTI AS ASKING FOR OPINION.</b></p>
ii] #The period to which the information relates	
iii] \$ description of the information required	
iv] Whether information is required by post or person	BY POST
v] In case by Post [Ordinary, Registered or Speed]	ORDINARY
vi] Purpose for which the information is required	TO PROTECT RIGHT TITLE AND INTEREST

1. KINDLY REPLY AS PER TIME BOUND CONDITIONS OF RTI.
2. **PLEASE DO NOT DIRECT FOR REPLY TO WEBSITE ADDRESS** FOR THE ANSWERS ASKED. KINDLY PROVIDE SPECIFIC RELEVANT REPLY PERTAINING TO MY RTI FOR THE QUESTIONS/CLARIFICATIONS ASKED AND IF THERE ARE ANY CHARGES TO PROVIDE THE SAME, THAT IS FOR PHOTO COPYING ETC, PLEASE LET ME KNOW. I WILL PAY TO GIVE ME ANSWERS.
3. PLEASE MENTION, MY ASKED POINTS AND GIVE INFORMATION AS WHATEVER IS AVAILABLE.
4. KINDLY REPLY IN ENGLISH OR IN HINDI, FOR WHICH I SHALL BE OBLIGED.
5. PLEASE FORWARD MY RTI TO CONCERNED PERSON / DEPARTMENT UNDER COPY TO ME IN CASE THIS INFORMATION REQUESTED IS NOT WITH YOU.

  
 JAYANTA KUMAR NAYAK

DATE: 08<sup>th</sup> JUNE, 2019  
PLACE: MUMBAI

आयकर विभाग

INCOME TAX DEPARTMENT

JAYANTA KUMAR NAYAK

LAKSHMAN NAYAK

04/05/1986

Permanent Account Number

ANVFN4715H

LAKSHMAN NAYAK

Signature

भारत सरकार

GOVT OF INDIA



# MU official slapped with Rs 25K fine for not giving information under RTI

State information commission directs varsity's vice chancellor to conduct a probe, fix responsibility, and take disciplinary action against all involved

Mumbai Mirror Bureau  
mirrorfeedback  
@timesgroup.com

TWEETS @MumbaiMirror

**T**he state information commission (SIC) has slapped a fine of Rs 25,000 on Mumbai University's public information officer for failing to provide information related to re-evaluation under the Right to Information Act.

The SIC's order, dated November 15, further directs the varsity's vice chancellor to conduct a probe in the matter, fix responsibility on the officials involved, and take disciplinary action.

RTI activist Aakash Vedak had filed a query in October 2017, seeking data on the income generated by and expenditure incurred on the process of re-evaluation. The commission has ordered that Vedak be given the information by December 10 this year.

"I had asked for the data from 2010 to 2017, when the re-evaluation charges per subject were Rs 500. In 2017, the university decreased the re-evaluation fee to Rs 250 per subject," Vedak told Mirror.

## Varsity did not reveal expenditure data

He said at first, the university did not furnish any information. When he filed his first appeal in December 2017, they gave him the data for the



RTI activist Aakash Vedak

income earned from re-evaluation fees, but did not divulge the expenditure.

"From 2010-17, the varsity has annually earned Rs 4-5 crore on average from the re-checking applications. It further earned Rs 15-20 lakh in photocopying charges. I then appealed for a second time. In the reply to my second appeal, they [the university] said they did not have a separate head under which to record re-evaluation expenses. Such expenditure would include payments to teachers, expenses on photocopying, and allied

“  
[The university] said it did not have a separate head under which to record re-evaluation expenses.... How can such a large university not have the records of re-evaluation expenditure?”

— Aakash Vedak

stationery. How can such a large university not have the records of re-evaluation expenditure? Per official data, around 30 per cent students have been found to have passed exams in the re-evaluation process. This also calls the quality of moderation into question. Delays in re-evaluation results have meant that many students appear for the ATKT exams, only to find out later that they had actually cleared the subject," Vedak said.

## Univ officials fined in the past too: Spokesperson

A university spokesperson said varsity officials had been fined on a few occasions in the past. "I will have to look at the order. The accounts department handles queries related to income and expenditure," the spokesperson said.