

Central Information Commission, New Delhi
File No. CIC/SH/A/2016/000005
Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (19)

Date of hearing : 12th January 2017

Date of decision : 12th January 2017

Name of the Appellant : **SHRI BAGESHWAR PRASAD KUSHWAHA**
S/O- SHAKTIGRAM KUSHWAHA
VILL- JAMEEN BARI,
PO- BHAGWANPUR, DISTT- BALIYA
UTTAR PRADESH

Name of the Public Authority/Respondent : **CENTRAL PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER,**
UNION BANK OF INDIA
REGIONAL OFFICE, 466/2/3,
HARIHAR PD. DUBEY MARG,
DAUDPUR, GORAKHPUR, UP- 273001

RTI Application filed on : 18/12/2014

CPIO replied on : 07/01/2015

First Appeal filed on : 28/01/2015

First Appellate Authority order on : —

2nd Appeal received on : 09/11/2015

The Appellant was present at the NIC Studio, Baliya.

On behalf of the Respondents, Shri Vikas Anand, Law Officer was present at the NIC Studio, Gorakhpur.

Information Commissioner : **Shri Sharat Sabharwal**

Information sought

This matter concerns an RTI application filed by the Appellant, seeking information on four points regarding the functioning of CCTV camera and transactions of an ATM.

The CPIO reply

The CPIO, vide letter dated 17.1.2015, denied the information under section 8 (1) (d), (e) & (j) of the RTI Act.

Grounds of the First Appeal

Not satisfied with the CPIO's reply.

Order of the First Appellate Authority

No order passed.

Grounds of the Second Appeal

Information sought not provided.

Relevant facts emerging during the Hearing, Discussion and Decision

The Appellant stated that he made some withdrawals from his account through an ATM of the Respondent Bank on 13.11.2014. However, the money received by him was Rs. 10,000/- less than the amount debited to his account. He submitted that he made a complaint dated 24.11.2014 to the Respondents. However, he has not been informed of their findings in the matter. The Respondents reiterated the reply of the CPIO to deny the information. The representative of the Respondents was not aware of the action taken on the Appellant's complaint dated 24.11.2014. The Appellant wants Rs. 10,000/- to be reimbursed to him with interest.

2. We have considered the records and the submissions of both the parties. In so far as the RTI application is concerned, the CPIO should provide to the Appellant the information on point No. 1 regarding functioning of the CCTV camera at the ATM. As regards points No. 2, 3 and 4, we note that the information sought relates to the amount of money placed by the Respondents in the ATM, the total money withdrawn and the details of the accounts from which it was withdrawn. This is clearly information relating to the internal operations of the bank and regarding third party

customers and cannot be provided to the Appellant. The Commission is not competent to grant the prayer of the Appellant to reimburse Rs. 10,000/- to him. However, the CPIO is directed to inform the Appellant about the findings of the bank on his complaint dated 24.11.2014. In case the complaint in question is not available on the records of the bank, the CPIO should obtain a copy of the same from the Appellant. The CPIO should comply with our above directives, within twenty days of the receipt of this order, under intimation to the Commission. Such information, as is provided, should be provided free of charge.

3. With the above directions and observations, the appeal is disposed of.
4. Copies of this order be given free of cost to the parties.

Sd/-
(Sharat Sabharwal)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy. Additional copies of orders shall be supplied against application and payment of the charges prescribed under the Act to the CPIO of this Commission.

(Vijay Bhalla)
Deputy Registrar