

അപേക്ഷകന്റെ ഒപ്പില്ലാത്ത അപേക്ഷക നിയമപ്രാബല്യമുണ്ടാകില്ല. ആയതിനാൽ അപേക്ഷയിലെ ന്യൂനത പരിഹരിക്കുവാൻ അപേക്ഷകനോട് ആവശ്യപ്പെടാവുന്നതാണ്. വിവരങ്ങൾ എവിടെയാണുണ്ടാവുക എന്ന് ബോധ്യമുള്ളപ്പോൾ അപേക്ഷ മനഃപൂർവ്വം മറ്റേതെങ്കിലും പബ്ലിക് അതോറിറ്റിയിലേക്കു അയക്കുവാൻ പാടില്ല

**Ground of the Second Appeal:**

The Applicant submitted the RTI Application to the EPF Office Trivandrum , through the office of the Prime Minister. The PMO transferred the application to the CPIO , Ministry of Labour and Employment on 17.09.2010.In the meanwhile (04/10/2010), the applicant requested the EPF, Trivandrum to add his e-mail id and mobile no. to the original application. No reply was received. On 24.01.2011, he received intimation of his RTI application being rejected and returned on account of unsigned application. The appellant claims this to be false.

**Relevant Facts emerging during Hearing:**

The following were present:

**Appellant:** Mr. Alex K.A. on video conference from NIC-Pathanamthitta Kerala Studio;

**Respondent:** Ms. Kavitha Jorje, PIO & RPFC-II on video conference from NIC-Kerala State Center Studio;

The appellant has sent an unsigned RTI application which has been rejected by the PIO. He claims to have sent email and another application later. Since the RTI application was not signed by him it cannot be considered a valid RTI application. Also the Commission feels that sending RTI application to the PM's office when the information is sought about PF is not right and a citizen should try and file RTI application where he believes the information exist.

**Decision:**

The Appeal is disposed.

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 of cost as per Section 7(6) of RTI Act.