

**CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**CLUB BUILDING (NEAR POST OFFICE)**  
**OLD JNU CAMPUS, NEW DELHI- 110067**  
TELE. NO. - 011026179548

Decision no. CIC/DS/A/2011/002300/VS/00276  
Appeal No. CIC/DS/A/2011/002300/VS  
Dated: 07.06.2012

**Appellant:** ✓ Shri Shaharyar Mohamad Afzal  
1122-A, Sir Syed Nagar,  
Aligarh-202002, UP

**Respondent:** ✓ PIO,  
State Bank of India,  
R.A.S.M.E.C.C.C.  
Aligarh-202001 (U.P.)

**Date of Hearing:** 07.06.2012

**ORDER**

**Facts:**

The appellant sought information on 20.01.2011 on 14 points regarding the different securitization agencies engaged by the bank. Besides, he also sought information regarding the industrial and housing units sold during the last few years.

2. The PIO in his reply dated 14.02.2011 denied the information on the ground that replies to multiple queries in a single application cannot be furnished as per section 7(1) of the RTI Act, 2005.

3. The appellant, vide his appeal dated 11.03.2011, submitted to the First Appellate Authority (FAA) that Section 7(1) of the RTI Act does not prohibit seeking information on multiple queries.

4. On 09.04.2011, the FAA held that the request made by the appellant had queries on many subjects, which were not specific to the area of reference, i.e., whether the information was required for the branch or the bank level. The FAA further held that the appellant had presumed that there was a single file containing information to all his queries but no such single file existed.

5. The FAA, while upholding the CPIO's decision as valid and correct, stated that the appellant's queries were either open-ended or roving in nature and in the form of explanations seeking reasons, and this does not come under the definition of "information" under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act.



C. I. C. को सू० आ०
<b>ISSUED</b>
14 JUN 2012
D. No.....
Initials.....

6. Not satisfied with the FAA's decision, the appellant has filed a second appeal on 08.5.2011 requesting that the PIO be directed to furnish the information asked for. A plea has also been made for the imposition of penalty u/s 20(1) & 20(2) of the RTI Act, 2005 for intentionally withholding information.
7. During the hearing while the respondent was present through video conferencing, the appellant was not present. The respondent contended that the information sought is very bulky, scattered and voluminous and pertained to multiple queries. Therefore, the information could not be provided.
8. The respondent reiterated the contention of the FAA, and in support cited two previous orders by the Commission. These were: Rajendra Singh v. CBI, CIC/WB/C/2007/00967 dated 19.06.2009, and T.K. Roy v. Deptt. of Legal Affairs, CIC/AT/2009/000802 dated 15.01.2010. Elaborating on the point, the respondent stated that Section 7(1) of the RTI Act obligated an applicant to register in his RTI application only one type of request and that he was not entitled to ask multiple type of queries in one application and then expect the PIO to address each part. So, an application could comprise of one question with several clarifications or supporting questions but one application should not comprise of queries relating to multiple issues.
9. The respondent, during the video conferencing went on to cite the Supreme Court in civil appeal no. 6454 of 2011, arising out of SPL [C] No. 7526/2009 in the case of *Central Board of Secondary Education & Anr. v. Aditya Bandopadhyaya & Ors.*, where it was held that where the information sought is not a part of the record of a public authority and where such information is not required to be maintained under any law or the rules of regulations of public authority, the Act does not obligate the public authority to collect such non available information and then furnish it to an applicant.
10. The respondent read extensively from the decision of the CIC and the Supreme Court as evident from paras 8 and 9. It is apparent that the respondent has provided reasonable arguments in support of the decision of the FAA. Besides, the institutional system is also mindful that the resources of the public authority should not get disproportionately diverted.

**Decision:**

11. There is no reason to interfere with the decision of the FAA. However, if any material on securitization agencies, by way of a circular or information-document is available with the respondent, this should be made available to the appellant within 20 working days from the date of receipt of this order.



Appeal is disposed off. Copy of this decision be given free of cost to the parties.

*Vijai Sharma*  
**(Vijai Sharma)**  
**Information Commissioner**

**Authenticated True Copy**

*V.K. Sharma*  
**(V.K. Sharma)**  
**Designated Officer**

