

Central Information Commission, New Delhi
File No. CIC/SH/A/2016/000016 and CIC/SH/A/2016/000032
Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (19)

Date of hearing : 13th January 2017

Date of decision : 13th January 2017

Name of the Appellant : **SHRI LAXMAN SAH**
VILL-SAKHNAULI, P O - KHANPUR,
P S-AVTARNAGAR, DISTT.SARAN,
BIHAR-841207

Name of the Public Authority/Respondent : **CENTRAL PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER,**
CENTRAL BANK OF INDIA
REGIONAL OFFICE, MUZAFFARPUR,
PAWAPURI VIHAR BUILDING, N. H.
-28, BHAGWANPUR, MUZAFFARPUR,
BIHAR- 842 001

The Appellant was heard through audio-conferencing.

On behalf of the Respondents, Dr. N. K. Singh, Lead District Manager was present at the NIC Studio, Muzaffarpur.

Information Commissioner : **Shri Sharat Sabharwal**

These files contain appeals in respect of the RTI applications dated 7.5.2015 and 2.9.2015 filed by the Appellant seeking information regarding the account(s) of his father. Not satisfied with the response of the Respondents, he has approached the CIC in second appeal in both the cases.

2. With regard to the RTI application dated 7.5.2015 (file No. 000016), the Appellant stated that no response has been given by the Respondents in respect of the

MMDC account of his father. He claimed that the Respondents are hiding the information concerning the accounts of his father and alleged that they have misappropriated funds from the same. The Respondents reiterated that other than account No. 4983 of the Appellant's father, information about which was provided by the CPIO on 20.8.2015, they have no records of any other account of his father. In the above context, we note that in his order dated 15.10.2015, the FAA had directed the CPIO to provide the information about the MMDC account, if any. The CPIO is directed to comply with the above directive of the FAA, within ten days of the receipt of this order, under intimation to the Commission. Further, in case the Appellant has evidence or number of any other account of his father in his possession, he should provide the same to the CPIO. In the event of his doing so, the CPIO is directed to check the relevant records to ascertain whether the account in question belongs/belonged to the Appellant's father and, if so, provide information concerning the same to him.

3. In regard to the RTI application dated 2.9.2015 (file No. 000032), the Appellant stated that a copy of the withdrawal form concerning withdrawal of Rs. 24,000/- made by his father from his account has not been provided. The Respondents stated that a certified copy of the withdrawal form has been provided. The Appellant acknowledged that he has received it, but stated that it was sent after considerable lapse of time and questioned the authenticity of the document, whose copy has been provided to him. In the above context, we note that with the exception of the allegation of the Appellant, nothing has been placed on record to cast doubt over the

authenticity of the above document. In case, on the basis of the document provided to him, the Appellant believes that the withdrawal of Rs. 24,000/- was not made properly, he is at liberty to pursue the matter at an appropriate forum, as the Commission is not competent to address such grievances.

4. With the above direction and observations, the two appeals are disposed of.

5. 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