550/(A)
20/02/2023

Date: 17/02/2022

To
West Bengal Information Commission,
Khadya Bhavan,11 A Mirza Ghalib Street,
Kolkata - 700 087

Subject: 2nd Appeal under Section 19(3) of the Right to Information Act 2005

Reference: (1) My RTI Application dated 14/09/2020
(2) SPIO's reply dated 24/09/2022 vide Memo No. SDI-5088
(3) 1st Appeal dated 26/10/2022;
(4) SPIO's reply dated 18/11/2022 vide Memo No. SDI-5684, received on 22/11/2022

Dear Sir,

This Appeal is filed U/s 19(1) of the RTI Act 2005 on the grounds mentioned herein. I request your good office to accept my Appeal and dispose of the same based the prayers made herein within the prescribed time limit as mandated under the RTI Act.

1.	Name of the Applicant/Appellate	Souradeep Sarkar
2.	Complete postal address	2, Grastin Place, 2nd Floor, Kolkata – 700001, West Bengal.
3.	Date of filing of application for information under RTI Act	14/09/2022 (Self attested Photocopy Enclosed)
	Whether application fee paid; Mode of payment	Yes Court fees of Rs. 10/-
4.	Name of State Public Information Officer/State Assistant Public Information officer to whom the application was made and Address	Jt. Commissioner of Police (O), Kolkata Kolkata Police 18, Lalbazar Street, Kolkata 700001
	Whether RTI petition is transferred to another SPIO u/s 6(3) of the RTI Act 2005	Yes
5.	Gist of Information sought for	Q1. What is the salary drawn by Sub – Inspector of Police Station Charu Market, Mr. Rahul Deb Banerjee, since last 5 years? Q2. Since when he is holding the post of Sub Inspector of Police? Q3. Kindly inform the transfer rotation of the Sub – Inspector of Police, Mr. Rahul Deb Banerjee; Q4. What are the assets declared by the Sub

Souradeep Sarkar
Advocate

		– Inspector of Police Station Charu Market, Mr. Rahul Deb Banerjee? Please forward copies of the Assets Declaration submitted by him during last 5 years
6.	Have you received any response/information?	Yes response received declining our request, stating exemption under section 8(1)(j) of RTI Act. (self attested photocopy of response is attached)
7.	Date of filing 1st Appeal	26/10/2022 Self attested photocopy of the 1st Appeal is attached herewith.
8.	Authority to whom 1st appeal was made with address	Deputy Commissioner of Police, Appellate Authority South Division, Kolkata 34, Park Street, Kolkata – 700016
9.	Decision of the 1st Appellate Authority, if any, including number and date of the order:	Order Vide Memo No. SDI-5684 Order dated 18/11/2022 Recevied on 22/11/2022 Self attested photocopy of the order of the 1st Appellate Authority is attached herewith
10.	Grounds for Second appeal and relief sought (specify)	Q4. What are the assets declared by the Sub – Inspector of Police Station Charu Market, Mr. Rahul Deb Banerjee? Please forward copies of the Assets Declaration submitted by him during last 5 years. The above question was not replied by the 1st Appellate Authority, citing reason that the "this point falls under the category of exemptions as per Sec. 8(1)(J) of RTI, Act". Challenging the same, I would like to state that, disclosure of information such as assets, information and details of a Public servant, which is routinely collected by the Public authority and routinely provided by the Public servants, *cannot be construed as an invasion on the privacy of an individual*. There will only be a few exceptions to this rule which might

Soumalya Sarkar
Advocate

		relate to information which is obtained by a Public authority while using extraordinary powers such as in the case of a raid or phone-tapping. The Supreme Court has clearly ruled that even people who aspire to be public servants by getting elected have to declare their property details. If people who aspire to be public servants must declare their property details it is only logical that the details of assets of those who are public servants must be considered to be disclosable. Hence the exemption under Section 8(1) (j) cannot be applied in the instant case. Decision of CIC bearing No. CIC/SG/A/2009/001436/4247, is enclosed herewith for ready reference. This information was not dealt by the SPIO and Appellate Authority properly, hence second appeal is being preferred. SPIO is intentionally and with malafide intention denied to share information. Upon 1st appeal SPIO reluctantly provided only gave few information that too incomplete and again illegally denied balance information sought for. Information related to question No.4 may be served to the Applicant. Order may be passed to send the SPIO and 1st Appellate Authority for training under RTI. Penalty u/s 19(8) read with section 20(1) may be imposed against the SPIO & 1st Appeallate Authority for illegally deny the information sought for.

Advocate

		A Compensation from the public authority u/s 19(8)(b) may be given to the Applicant for loss of time and energy and cost for filing one after another appeal due to illegal denial of information by SPIO as well as 1st Appellate Authority and compensation on account of harassment & mental agony.
11.	If second appeal is filed after 90 days from the date on which the decision of 1st Appeallate Authority was received	Filed within 90 days

I am Indian citizen do hereby solemnly affirm that the statements made herein are true to my knowledge based on records and rests are my submissions to the Hon'ble West Bengal Information Commission.

I also declare that this matter is not previously filed with this Commission not is pending with any Court or Tribunal or Authority.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,

Souradeep Sarkar

(Souradeep Sarkar)

Enclosed:

(1) Copy of RTI Application dated 14/09/2022
(2) Copy of Reply sent by SPIO dated 24/09/2022
(3) Copy of 1st Appeal dated 26/10/2022
(4) Copy of Reply of 1st Appeal dated 18/11/2022
(5) Copy of Decision of CIC bearing File No. CIC/SG/A/2009/001436/4247

Government of West Bengal
Office of the Deputy Commissioner of Police
South Division
34, Park Street, Kolkata-700016

Memo No. SDI-5684 Dated 18-11-2022

From: SPIO
&
Assistant Commissioner of Police (I)
South Division
Kolkata

To: Mr. Souradeep Sarkar
2, Garstin Place, 2nd Floor,
Kolkata-700001. West Bengal.

Ref: Information Sought For under R.T.I Act 2005

Sir/Madam,

With due respect, in reference to the above, I the undersigned would like to inform you that as per your attached petition under RTI Act-2005, the point wise reply is as follows :-

1) Gross Salary of S.I. Rahul Dev Banerjee for the month of October-2022 is Rs.59760/-.
2) He is appointed as Sub-Inspector of Police, Kolkata w.e.f. 19.03.2008.
3) He has been joined South Division on 03.02.2019 and posted to Shakespeare Sarani P.S. and now posted to Charu Market PS. (South Division) w.e.f. 14.06.2021
4) This point falls under the category of exemptions as per Sec. 8(1)(J) of RTI Act, 2005.

Yours Sincerely,

S.P.I.O 18.11.22
&
(Debasish Sarkar)
Assistant Commissioner of Police (I)
South Division, Kolkata.

Asstt. Commn. of Police (I)
South Division
Kolkata

Souradeep Sarkar
Advocate

Memo No. SDI. 5684

Dated 18/11/2022

Registered with A/D

ON INDIA GOVERNMENT SERVICE

ভারত সরকারের কার্য্যে

West Bengal Form No. 59

Deputy Commissioner of Police
South Division,
34, Park Street, Kolkata-16

INVEST IN :-
NATIONAL DEFENCE CERTIFICATES

To

Mr. Souradeep Sarkar
2, Garstin Place, 2nd Floor,
Kolkata - 700001, West Bengal.

167

Forwarding Advocate

Sign In Register

हिन्दी

भारतीय डाक
India Post

You are here Home>> **Track Consignment**

Track Consignment

Quick help

* Indicates a required field.

* Consignment Number

RW934639110IN

Booked At	Booked On	Destination Pincode	Tariff	Article Type	Delivery Location	Delivery Confirmed On
Park Street HO	19/11/2022 13:36:11	700001	40.00	Registered Letter	KOLKATA GPO	21/11/2022 17:29:40

Event Details For : RW934639110IN

Current Status : Item Delivery Confirmed

Date	Time	Office	Event
21/11/2022	17:29:40	KOLKATA GPO	Item Delivery Confirmed
21/11/2022	12:21:14	KOLKATA GPO	Out for Delivery
21/11/2022	08:09:53	KOLKATA GPO	Item Received
20/11/2022	05:01:57	Kolkata RMS Mails TMO	Item Dispatched
20/11/2022	03:23:29	Kolkata RMS Mails TMO	Item Received
20/11/2022	02:11:29	Kolkata CRC L1R	Item Dispatched
20/11/2022	01:06:19	Kolkata CRC L1R	Item Bagged
19/11/2022	23:29:11	Kolkata CRC L1R	Item Received
19/11/2022	22:56:20	Kolkata RMS Mails TMO	Item Dispatched
19/11/2022	22:21:42	Kolkata RMS Mails TMO	Item Received
19/11/2022	13:36:11	Park Street HO	Item Booked

Home
About Us
Forms

Advocate

SD/SPL – 566/22 Dt – 28/10/22

Date: 26/10/2022

To
Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Appellate Authority
South Division, Kolkata
34, Park Street,
Kolkata - 700016

Subject: Appeal under Section 19(1) of the Right to Information Act 2005

Reference: (1) My RTI Application dated 14/09/2020
(2) SPIO's reply dated 24/09/2022 vide Memo No. SDI-5088

Dear Sir,

This Appeal is filed U/s 19(1) of the RTI Act 2005 on the grounds mentioned herein. I request your good office to accept my Appeal and dispose of the same based the prayers made herein within the prescribed time limit as mandated under the RTI Act.

1.	Name of the Applicant/Appellate	Souradeep Sarkar
2.	Appellant's Address for Communication	2. Grastin Place, 2nd Floor, Kolkata – 700001, West Bengal.
3.	RTI Application dated	14/09/2022 (Photocopy Enclosed)
4.	Time limit for preferring 1st Appeal	27/10/2022
5.	Delay in preferring 1st Appeal	No delay
6.	Whether copy of Reply by SPIO is enclosed with the Appeal	Yes (photocopy of the reply is enclosed)
7.	Name and Designation of SPIO	Assistant Commissioner of Police (I), South Division, Kolkata
8.	Particulars of Information sought for	Q1. What is the salary drawn by Sub – Inspector of Police Station Charu Market, Mr. Rahul Deb Banerjee, since last 5 years? Q2. Since when he is holding the post of Sub Inspector of Police? Q3. Kindly inform the transfer rotation of the Sub – Inspector of Police, Mr. Rahul Deb Banerjee; Q4. What are the assets declared by the Sub – Inspector of Police Station Charu Market, Mr. Rahul Deb Banerjee? Please forward copies of the Assets Declaration submitted

AC-I
D.C.S.D(S)
28.10.22

Souradeep Sarkar
Advocate

		by him during last 5 years
9.	Whether the SPIO has provided the information or refused	**Refused to share the information**
10.	Ground/s stated for refusal	**Attached reply of Addl. Officer-in-Charge Charu Market Police Station stating "query sought for falls under the category of exemptions as per Section 8(1)(j) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 and as such we could not provide any information at present.**
11	Grievances of Applicant:	1. The Applicant has not received the information as per his RTI application. 2. The information sough does not fall under exemption category;
12.	Grounds of Appeal	Disclosure of information such as assets, information and details of a Public servant, which is routinely collected by the Public authority and routinely provided by the Public servants, *cannot be construed as an invasion on the privacy of an individual.* There will only be a few exceptions to this rule which might relate to information which is obtained by a Public authority while using extraordinary powers such as in the case of a raid or phone-tapping. The Supreme Court has clearly ruled that even people who aspire to be public servants by getting elected have to declare their property details. If people who aspire to be public servants must declare their property details it is only logical that the details of assets of those who are public servants must be considered to be disclosable. Hence the exemption under Section 8(1) (j) cannot be applied in the instant case. Decision of CIC bearing No. CIC/SG/A/2009/001436/4247, is enclosed herewith for ready reference.
13.	**Prayers**	**1.** An order/direction to the SPIO or to the Officer-in-Charge Charu Market Police Station to provide the information sought for in my RTI Application be provided immediately free of cost

Sourabh Sarkar
Advocate

		as the SPIO has failed to provide the information within the prescribed time limit; **2.** Forward a recommendation to the State Information Commission to the effect that penalty of Rs. 500/- each day be imposed on the SPIO till information is furnished to the Applicant; **3.** Forward a recommendation for provision of training on the right to information for SPIO.

Respectfully request your good office to forward the decision in English is possible.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,

Souradeep Sarkar

(Souradeep Sarkar)

Enclosed: (1) Copy of RTI Application dated 14/09/2022 (2) Copy of Reply sent by SPIO (3) Copy of Decision of CIC bearing File No. CIC SG A 20/9/00143647247

Souradeep Sarkar
Advocate

Government of West Bengal
Office of the Deputy Commissioner of Police
South Division
34, Park Street, Kolkata-700016

Memo No SDI-5088 Dated 29.09.2022

From: SPIO
&
Assistant Commissioner of Police (I)
South Division
Kolkata

To: Mr. Souradeep Sarkar
2, Garstin Place, 2nd Floor,
Kolkata-700001, West Bengal.

Ref: Information Sought For under R.T.I Act 2005

Sir/Madam,

Enclosed, Please find the report in original from O/C Charu Market P.S, regarding your enquiry under RTI Act- 2005 as sought for.

Yours Sincerely,

S.P.I.O
&
Assistant Commissioner of Police (I)
South Division, Kolkata.

29/09/22

Asstt. Commr. of Police (I)
South Division
Kolkata

Souradeep Sarkar
Advocate

AC SD (I)

Re-the attached Memo No- SPIO/SD 195/22 dated 16.09.2022 arising out of RTI application of Sri Souradeep Sarkar regarding request to furnish the point wise information u/s RTI Act, 2005.

Sir,

In pursuant to the above petition, I beg to state that the query as sought for falls under the category of exemptions as per Section 8 (1) (j) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 and as such we could not provide any information at present.

This is for favour of your kind perusal and onward transmission to superiors, if approved.

Dated: 20.09.2022

Submitted

[Insp Hirak Dalapati]
Addl Officer-in-Charge
Charu Market Police Station
21/09/2022

Officer-in-Charge
Charu Market P.S.
Kolkata-33

Souradeep Sarkar
Advocate

SP/OFSD-195/22 dt. 16.09.22 SP-1664298887
LD-1267959

Dated: 07-Sept-2022

To
The SPIO
Jt. Commissioner of Police (O), Kolkata
Kolkata Police
18, Lalbazar Street, Kolkata
Pin-700001, West Bengal

12 SEP 2022

Application under Section 6 of the Right to Information Act, 2005

PART – I

1. Name of the Applicant : Mr. Souradeep Sarkar
2. Gender : Male
3. Father's Name : Mr. Sandip Sarkar
4. Address for correspondence : 2, Garstin Place, 2nd Floor, Kolkata – 700001, West Bengal

PART – II

5. Details of the information required :
   i. What is the salary drawn by Sub – Inspector of Police Station Charu Market, Mr. Rahul Deb Banerjee, since last 5 years?
   ii. Since when he is holding the post of Sub Inspector of Police? Kindly inform the transfer rotation of the Sub – Inspector of Police, Mr. Rahul Deb Banerjee;
   iii. What are the assets declared by the Sub – Inspector of Police Station Charu Market, Mr. Rahul Deb Banerjee? Please forward copies of the Assets Declaration submitted by him during last 5 years.

6. Application Fees of Rs. 10/- (Rupees Ten Only) is being paid along with the Application. Additional fees if any required for submitting the above information shall be paid by me, as may be intimated to me.

7. Declaration of the Applicant:
   I am a bonafide citizen of India and owe allegiance to the sovereignty, unity and integrity of India and have not voluntarily acquired the citizenship of another Country.

Place: Kolkata

Date: 07-Sept-2022

Souradeep Sarkar
Advocate
(Signature of the Applicant)

Souradeep Sarkar
Advocate

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
Club Building (Near Post Office),
Old JNU Campus, New Delhi - 110067.
Tel: +91-11-26161796

Decision No. CIC/SG/A/2009/001436/4247
Appeal No. CIC/SG/A/2009/001436

Relevant Facts emerging from the Appeal:

Appellant	:	Mr. Sat Prakash Tyagi, S/o Bishamber Dayal Tyagi, H.No.38, Tyagi Mohalla Chhatter Pur, New Delhi-110074.
Respondent	:	Mr. Vipin Behari PIO **Delhi Jal Board,** **Govt. of N.C.T. of Delhi,** O/o the Secretary, Varunalaya Ph-II, Karol Bagh, New Delhi-110005.
RTI application filed on	:	13/01/2009
PIO replied	:	11/02/2009
First appeal filed on	:	09/03/2009
First Appellate Authority order	:	13/04/2009
Second Appeal received on	:	09/06/2009

Sl.	Information sought	PIO's reply
1	As intimated vide letter no.DJB/Vig./RTI/2008/5970, dated 12.11.2008 that Anil Tyagi, JE informed on 20.6.95 about the criminal cases registered against him a) U/sec. 188 IPC & (b) U/sec. 323/452/506 IPC.	No information has been sought under this point.
2	First case u/s 308 was registered against Anil Kumar Tyagi on 07.11.1993 and as per Conduct Rule, it was his duty to immediately inform the department after registration of aforesaid criminal case. Action taken report on receipt of information about his involvement in the aforesaid case.	The matter is under investigation and as per Rule 8 (h) of RTI Act 2005, the information cannot be provided at this stage.
3	As per letter Anil Tyagi, JE had informed seven times about his involvement in criminal cases. Diary no. and date of his information diarised in the Diary Register.	Information sought under points 3 to 9 are not available in this office. This might have either in the office of concerned DDO or in Admn. Branch.
4	Photo copies of each page of Diary Register on which the information received from Anil Tyagi, J.E. was diarised.	
5	Action taken report on receipt of information from Anil Kumar Tyagi.	
6	Had Anil Kumar Tyagi, J.E .shown these in his verification form filled up by him at the time of his appointment/regularization in	

Awadhesh Gupta
Advocate

	Delhi Jal Board.	
7	Details of properties acquired by J.E. Anil Tyagi after his appointment in Delhi Jal Board.	
8	Details of properties acquired by J.E. Anil Tyagi after his appointment as J.E. in Delhi Jal Board.	
9	Whether J.E. Anil Tyagi had intimated/sought prior sanction of the competent authority on all occasions at the time of sale/purchase of said properties. Copies of applications submitted by him alongwith orders issued by the competent authority in this context may be supplied.	

Grounds for First Appeal:
Incomplete and irrelevant reply received from the PIO.

Order of the First Appellate Authority:
The First Appellate Authority ordered "It has been noticed that sufficient information has already been furnished to the Appellant. I uphold the order of PIO."

Grounds for Second Appeal
Unsatisfactory order, upholding the incomplete and irrelevant reply of the PIO.

Relevant Facts emerging during Hearing on 17 July 2009:
The following were present:
Appellant: Mr. Sat Prakash Tyagi
Respondent: Mr. Vipin Behari, PIO
Third Party: Mr. Anil Kumar Tyagi
The Appellatn states that he has filed the appeal since he wants the details for his queries 7 & 8 that is details of the property of Mr Anil Kumar Tyagi. The PIO will inform the Appellant about the status of the investigation. The PIO states that there is no diary number on the statements of Mr. Anil Tyagi, JE and others in this matter. The PIO states that the information on the assets of JE Mr. Anil Tyagi demanded in queries 7 & 8 should not be disclosed since, "the property returns submitted by the official are confidential documents and disclosure of this personal information has no relationship to the public activity or interest and hence denied under Section 8(1)(j)."

The third party Mr. Anil Tyagi states, "My personal property details and other allied details should not be given to the Appellant, who is already having many property dispute cases in different courts in Delhi with me. Such documents will be misused against me in the courts affecting the fair decisions in the court. Moreover we and all my family members are facing acute mental agony and fear of life from the Appellant. Such matters have already being informed to the Police also."

The Appellant states, "I did not get the criminal cases registered against the third party. The charges being made against me are false.

The Order is reserved during the hearing on 17 July 2009.

Sd/- Sd/-
Advocate

Decision announced on 23 July 2009:

The Commission can allow denial of information only based on the exemptions listed under Section 8 (1) of the act. The PIO has claimed that the information should not be disclosed since it is exempted from disclosure under Section 8 (1) (j).

Under Section 8 (1) (j) information which has been exempted is defined as:

"information which relates to personal information the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest, or which would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the individual unless the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer or the appellate authority, as the case may be, is satisfied that the larger public interest justifies the disclosure of such information."

To qualify for this exemption the information must satisfy the following criteria:

1. It must be personal information.

Words in a law should normally be given the meanings given in common language. In common language we would ascribe the adjective 'personal' to an attribute which applies to an individual and not to an Institution or a Corporate. **From this it flows that 'personal' cannot be related to Institutions, organisations or corporates.** (Hence we could state that Section 8 (1) (j) cannot be applied when the information concerns institutions, organisations or corporates.).

The phrase 'disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest' means that the information must have some relationship to a Public activity.

Various Public authorities in performing their functions routinely ask for 'personal' information from Citizens, and this is clearly a public activity. When a person applies for a job, or gives information about himself to a Public authority as an employee, or asks for a permission, licence or authorisation, all these are public activities. The information sought in this case by the appellant has certainly been obtained in the pursuit of a public activity.

We can also look at this from another aspect. **The State has no right to invade the privacy of an individual.** There are some extraordinary situations where the State may be allowed to invade on the privacy of a Citizen. In those circumstances special provisos of the law apply, always with certain safeguards. Therefore it can be argued that where the State routinely obtains information from Citizens, this information is in relationship to a public activity and will not be an intrusion on privacy.

Therefore we can state that disclosure of information such as assets of a Public servant, - which is routinely collected by the Public authority and routinely provided by the Public servants,- cannot be construed as an invasion on the privacy of an individual. There will only be a few exceptions to this rule which might relate to information which is obtained by a Public authority while using extraordinary powers such as in the case of a raid or phone-tapping. Any other exceptions would have to be specifically justified. Besides the Supreme Court has clearly ruled that even people who aspire to be public servants by getting elected have to declare their property details. If people who aspire to be public servants must declare their property details it is only logical that the details of assets of those who are public servants must be considered to be disclosable. Hence the exemption under Section 8(1) (j) cannot be applied in the instant case.

In view of this the PIO's and the third party's claim for exemption of this information are not allowed. PIOs are advised to ensure that such information is provided to the Appellant within 30 days of receiving the RTI Application.

Sd/- Sarkar
Advocate

Decision:

The appeal is allowed.

The PIO will give the information on queries 7 & 8 to the Appellant before 10 August 2009.

This decision is announced in open chamber.

Notice of this decision be given free of cost to the parties.

Any information in compliance with this order will be provided free cost as per Section 7(6) of RTI Ac.

Shailesh Gandhi
Information Commissioner
23 July 2009

(In any correspondence on this decision, mentioned the complete decision number.)

(AK)

Special Post

To
Deputy Commissioner of Police
South Division, Kolkata
34, Park Street,
Kolkata-700016

From:-
Souradeep Sarkar
2, Grastin Place, 2nd floor,
Kolkata-700001

Courier Cover
Advised

RECEIVED
CONTENTS NOT VERIFIED
OFFICE OF THE D. C. SOUTH DIVISION
34, PARK STREET, KOL-16
DT. 28 / 10 / 22 TIME.....

Email **State Chief Information Commissioner West Bengal**

Hearing on 24-11-2025

From : State Chief Information Commissioner West Bengal <scic-wb@nic.in>

Mon, Nov 03, 2025 04:30 PM

1 attachment

Subject : Hearing on 24-11-2025

To : Cyber Police Station, DD <cyberps@kolkatapolice.gov.in>

Cc : sovan raychaudhury <sovan.raychaudhury@gmail.com>

Please find the attachment, for further details visit our website

West Bengal Information Commission

WBIC-RTI-A-100039-1992-2025 HN.pdf
16 KB

D.NO-4613 (ATR)
14/11/25

Link D.NO -

Government of West Bengal
Office of the Commissioner of Police, Kolkata,
Report (RTI) Section,
18, Lalbazar Street, Kolkata-700 001.

Memo No._____/RPT+RTI+Enclo
R- 245 /25

Dated_____

To: 1) The Deputy Commissioner of Police,
& Appellate Authority (RTI),
South Division, Kolkata.

2) The Assistant Commissioner of Police,
& State Public Information Officer,
South Division, Kolkata.

W.B. INFORMATION COM
RECEIVED
14 NOV 2025
09
KHADYA BHAWAN, KOL-91

Sub: Notice of Hearing

Ref: Complaint No. 104004 of 2025 i/r/o Souradeep Sarkar Under RTI Act, 2005.

Enclosed please find the self-explanatory Memo No. 5927-WBIC/RTI/A/104004/1976/2025 dated 03.11.2025 in original along with its' enclosure from the end of the Section Officer, West Bengal Information Commission, Khadya Bhaban, Kolkata arose out of the **Complaint No. 104004 of 2025** reference to above. A copy of this office Memo No. 14065/RPT+RTI+Enclo (R-04/2022) Dated 14.09.2022 is also annexed herewith for ready reference.

Subhojit
P/ Linn with file.
14/11/25

It is, therefore, requested that necessary action for compliance of the direction of the West Bengal Information Commission be taken.

Kindly treat it as extremely urgent.

sd/-

Jt. Commissioner of Police (MOD), Kolkata &
State Public Information Officer,
Kolkata Police.

Memo No.23250 /RPT+RTI
R- 245 /25

Dated 12/11/25

Copy forwarded to:

1) Shri Rupak Bhattacharjee, Section Officer, West Bengal Information Commission, Khadya Bhaban, 11A, Mirza Galib Street, Kolkata-700087 for information please, vide his office Memo No. 5927-WBIC/RTI/A/104004/1976/2025 dated 03.11.2025 received on 06.11.2025.

2) Souradeep Sarkar of 2, Garstin Place, 2nd Floor, Kolkata-700001 for information.

12/11/25

Jt. Commissioner of Police (MOD), Kolkata &
State Public Information Officer,
Kolkata Police.

S.S
Hearing
24/11/25