

## J&K Institute of Management, Public Administration & Rural Development (IMPA & RD) Sidhra Near ASCOMS, (Batra Hospital), Jammu - 180017

No: IMPA/Adm/R-68/2018/ 597/-74

Dated: 12/07/2018

## Order under Section 7(1) of the J&K RTI Act, 2009

Sh. K.R. Tak C/o Sh. Krishan Lal Saraf M/s Beli Ram Krishan Lal Saraf, Jewellers, Chowk Chabutra, Jammu – 180001 has made an RTI application dated: 13.06.2018 received by this office on 18.06.2018. In terms of Section 7(1) and as per available records, the information seeker is provided with the information as under:-

S. No.	Information Sought	Information Supplied/ Response
i)	Furnish information as per statement made before Chief Information Commissioner, J&K State Information Commission Camp Jammu vide decision dated 23.05.2017 and also reasons of inordinate delay of more than one year;	As per the order dated: 23.05.2017 issued by the Chief Information Commissioner, J&K State Information Commission, Jammu, rejected your 2 <sup>nd</sup> Appeal and it has been clearly stated at para 03 of the order that the FAA/PIO of IMPA (Respondents) stated that they were ready the provide the requisite information even otherwise for which purpose the appellant should contact the PIO IMPA but you did not contact the PIO therefore there is no inordinate delay on the part of the Institute.
ii)	Furnish a copy of verification got conducted by J&K IMPA & Rural Development Jammu in light of examination and Forensic expert opinion of documents by Dr. R.L. Dhar, Director (Rtd.) J&K Forensic Science Laboratory and Forensic Consultant, EQD. Also assign reasons of inordinate delay of more than five months.	The Verification could not become possible as the original copy endorsed by the then DG IMPA marked to the then Joint Director is not traceable in office except the copy of your representation endorsed in original by the then Joint Director. You are as such requested to visit this office to check the same.
iii)	Furnish copies of following and also justify sub-para (e) below:  a) D.O Letter dated 26.09.2012 by Sh. Pankaj Jain IAS;  b) Reference whereunder IMPA&RD sought clarification from GAD on the rate of incentive payable to Sh. Pankaj Jain IAS during his posting in IMPA;  c) Letter whereunder GAD conveyed opinion/advice tendered by Finance	With regard to a, b, c & d, a copy of letter No. IMPA/Acctts/12/22, dated 12.10.2012 along with due drawn statement of 30% Incentive has been made available from IMPA Srinagar and the copy of DO letter under reference is not reportedly traceable. Annexure - A
	Department vis-a-vis Shri Pankaj Jain IAS; d) Approval accorded by authorities for payment of residual incentives arrears to Sh. Pankaj Jain IAS;	

8 0 · S

	e) Justify how rules 2.41 and 2.43 of J&K Financial Code Volume – I and concurrence of Finance Department are applicable vis-a-vis my case and why the said rules and concurrence was not applicable to Sh. Pankaj Jain vide points (viii & xi) of 3 <sup>rd</sup> RTI application dated: 10.08.2015.  e) Since the matter has been referred to GAD for advice which is still awaited in your case whereas, in case of Mr. Pankaj Jain , IAS the arrears of Incentive seem to have paid to him on the analogy of advice tendered by the Finance Department as the officer was not drawing salaries against Apex /Cabinet Secretary 's Scale . Copy enclosed as Annexure - B  As per record, the information sought by you
iv)	Why U.O. No. INT 19 Co. 19 Which cannot be responses to point (ii) vis-a-vis 1st RTI application dated 10.02.2015 and points (i), (ii) and (iv) vis-a-vis 3rd RTI application dated 08.07.2015 to give incorrect, misleading and evasive responses?
v)	Furnish the following copies:  a) Reference whereunder IMPA&RD sought opinion/advice from GAD on the rate of incentive payable to on the rate of incentive payable to 07.03.2014 is enclosed as Annexure-C
	b) Letter whereunder GAD conveyed opinion/ advice tendered by Finance Department vis-a-vis my case pertaining to the payment of residual incentive arrears and also assign reasons of inordinate delay since  b) In response to (a) above, the GAD had sought information vide their letter No. GAD(Ser) KAS/ 209/97 dated 19.05.2014 and dated 02.12.2014 (copies enclosed as Annexure – D & E Which was provided to GAD vide this office letter No.IMPA/Accounts /2010/346/3497-99 dated 31.12.2014, (copy enclosed as Annexure – F). Besides, FA / CAO, GAD vide this office letters No.IMPA /Acctts /RTI/2015/382/2737-38, dated 15.12.2015, letter No. IMPA/Acctts/RTI/2015 /382/3183-84, dated 12.01.2016 & No. IMPA/Acctts/RTI/2015/382/3136-38, dated 14.03.2017 has been requested to apprise with the opinion of the Finance Department in the matter. (Copy enclosed as Annexure – G, H & I)
	c) Opinion/advice tendered by Finance Department vis-a-vis my case pertaining to payment of till date.
	Sh. M.I. Khanday IAS and Shri
vi	Furnish copy of date of receipt receipt register maintained by IMPA&RD, Regional Centre, Jammu whereunder date of receipt of my 3 <sup>rd</sup> RTI application dated
	dated: 10.08.2015 issued in 3 <sup>rd</sup> RTI dated: 10.08.2015 issued in 3 <sup>rd</sup>
	application to system

	Lad it on official website?
viii)	As per available record, the Institute had not forwarded a letter to GAD for clarification forwarded a letter to GAD for clarification but the original file on the subject was sent to but the original file on the subject was sent to
	attached with responses to my polication (ii), and (iv) vis-a-vis 3 <sup>rd</sup> RTI application payment of 30% incentive in your favour.
•.	is the import of Annexure "A"?  The Government Order under reference has is the import of Annexure "A"?
ix)	1986 dated: 22.06.1966 tassification of deputationists purposes of classification of deputationists borne on AIS and State Services who were paid 15% incentive in terms of 5 <sup>th</sup> CPC and paid 15% incentive in terms of 4 <sup>th</sup> CPC respectively? taken by the their Financian taken b
x)	Being similarly situated, why be analogy of residual incentive arrears on the analogy of Since the matter is under consideration.
	Sh. M.I. Khanday IAS and Sh. 47 IAS? Their cases were settled within 47
	days and 16 days respectively when
	case has been hanging their cases
xi)	dated 09.11.2012, 19.11.2014, pay, however, the matter regarded for clarification / 30% Incentive is pending for clarification / 30% Incentive is pending for clarification / opinion in GAD as such the copy of notings opinion in GAD are enclosed as
	authorities for final orders, preases.  Annexure-X, G, H & I.
-	copies of their final orders/approvens,  ii) One page Photostat copy annexed as 'C'  iii) One page Photostat copy annexed as 'C'  iii) One page Photostat copy annexed as 'C'
X	ii) One page Photostat copy afficient as was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to me vide response to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnished to my 3 <sup>rd</sup> was furnish
	RTI application dates the following
	information and also copy as indicated at
	a) Why one page Photostat copy annexed as 'C' instead of two annexed as 'C' instead of two enclosed herewith as Annexure – I
	b) Why endorsement dated b) As per available record, it has been margin of that the endorsement made o the margin of that the endorsement made to the the
	22.03.2013 made on the many on the reminder was marked transferred on the reminder was marked transferred to the policy of the p
	B.B. Vyas IAS the then Do was from the Institute and the original from the Institute and the original from the same is not traceable from record of the same is not traceable from record from the Institute and the original from the Institute and the Institute and the original from the Institute and the original from the Institute and the original from the Institute and Institute a
	c) Why the said reminder dated c) Both officers transferred from Institute, hence no commen
Qı	then Joint Director, the them 2 in the distribution of the distrib
a/ (	and 16.07.2014 on 143
	Rol 20 W

	d) Copy of my reminder dated 20.03.2013 consisting of two leaves and also containing endorsement made by Sh. B.B. Vyas IAS the then DG IMPA&RD.	<ul> <li>d) Copy enclosed as Annexure – L whereas, the original copy containing endorsement made by Sh. B. B. Vyas, IAS is not traceable form record.</li> </ul>
xiii)	Furnish the following copies:-  a) Order issued by GAD Flagged at 'D' vide sub-para (iii) of para 85 vide Annexure 'A' vis-a-vis 3 <sup>rd</sup> RTI application dated 08.07.2015 and U.O. No. IMPA/DG/PS dated 07.03.2014;	As per available record the file under reference is still pending in GAD for clarification which is still awaited.
	b) Proposal forwarded to GAD regarding desirability of continuing the incentive vide sub-para (iv) of para 85 Annexure "A" vis-a-vis 3 <sup>rd</sup> RTI application dated 08.07.2015 and U.O. No. IMPA/DG/PS dated 07.03.2014;	b) Please refer to Annexure – C
	c) Observations of GAD at note para 82 ante vide note para 85;	c) As per record the file under reference is lying in GAD as the reference with regards to note para 82 is not available which would be collected from GAD and provided to you accordingly in due course of time.
xiv)	What is the rationale behind seeking 2 <sup>nd</sup> opinion on identical issue vis-a-vis my case tantamounting to breach of principle of Res Judicata?	No comments to offer as the case has been forwarded by the then authorities.

For further queries if any you may visit the office of undersigned on any working day and time convenient to you.

Deputy Director/PIO,

Copy to:-

1. Joint Director (1st Appellate Authority), J&K IMPA&RD, Srinagar.

PS to VC & DG for information of Vice Chairman & Director General, J&K IMPA&RD.

3. System Administrator for uploading above order on website.

4. File concerned.