

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

2nd Floor, August Kranti Bhawan,
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066

Decision No. CIC/SB/A/2015/000106

Dated 17.10.2016

Appellant : Shri Akhilanand Mishr,
Vill. Rohalki Dayalpur,
PO Bhagwanpur,
Distt. Haridwar, Uttarakhand.

Respondent : Central Public Information Officer,
Central Information Commission,
2nd Floor, B-Wing, August Kranti Bhawan,
New Delhi-110 066.

Date of Hearing : 17.10.2016

Relevant dates emerging from the appeal:

RTI application filed on : 27.02.2015

CPIO's reply : 27.03.2015

First appeal filed on : 01.05.2015

FAA's order : 27.05.2015

Second appeal filed on : 27.06.2015

ORDER

1. Shri Akhilanand Mishr filed an application dated 27.02.2015 under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) before the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO), Central Information Commission (CIC) seeking information on five points pertaining to interpretation of various sections of the RTI Act.

2. The appellant filed a second appeal dated 27.06.2015 before the Commission on the grounds that he is not satisfied with the information provided to him by the CPIO as well as the First Appellate Authority (FAA).

Hearing:

3. Shri Vivek Kumar representative of the appellant Shri Akhilanand Mishra attended the hearing through video conferencing. The respondent Shri A.K. Sharma, CPIO, RTI, CIC was present in person.

4. The appellant submitted that information sought has not been provided to him in response to his RTI application on the grounds that no information as per Section 2(f) of the RTI Act has been sought.

5. The respondent submitted that the appellant was informed vide letter dated 27.03.2015 that the information sought by him is in the nature of interpretation of the provision of law and, therefore, does not fall within the definition of “information” as defined under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act. The respondent further submitted that under the RTI Act the CPIO is only obliged to provide information available on records and is not obliged to provide interpretation or clarifications.

Decision:

6. The Commission, after hearing the submissions of both the parties and perusing the records, observes that the information sought by the appellant is in the nature of seeking interpretation of various provisions of law, which the CPIO is not obliged to provide as the same is not covered under the definition of “information” under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act. Hence, no further action is required in the matter.

7. With the above observations, the appeal is disposed of.

8. Copy of decision be given free of cost to the parties.

(Sudhir Bhargava)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(V.K. Sharma)
Designated Officer