

Central Information Commission, New Delhi
File No. CIC/MP/C/2016/000054/SH and CIC/MP/C/2016/000086/SH
(Two same cases)
Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (18)

Date of hearing : 13th April 2017

Date of decision : 13th April 2017

Name of the Complainant : SHRI VED PRAKASH GUPTA

Name of the Public Authority/Respondent : CENTRAL PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER,
PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK
CIRCLE OFFICE, 4, VIBHUTI
KHAND, OPP. P.I.C.U.P.
BUILDING, GOMTI NAGAR,
LUCKNOW, UP- 226010

RTI Application filed on : 17/11/2015

CPIO replied on : —

First Appeal filed on : —

First Appellate Authority order on : —

Complaint received on : 15/02/2016

The Complainant was not present.

On behalf of the Respondents, Shri S. K. Singh, Law Officer was present at the NIC Studio, Lucknow.

Information Commissioner : Shri Sharat Sabharwal

File No. CIC/MP/C/2016/000054/SH

Information sought

This matter concerns an RTI application filed by the Complainant, seeking information on nine points regarding the application given by Smt. Sheela Gupta with regard to withdrawal of certain amount from her accounts, action taken on her representation and related issues.

The CPIO reply

No reply given.

Grounds of complaint to the CIC

Information sought not provided.

CIC/MP/C/2016/000086/SH

This file contains an RTI application dated 17.11.2015, addressed to the RTI Division Board Office-4, Vibhuti Khand, Lucknow, seeking the same information as in the RTI application on File No. CIC/MP/C/2016/000054/SH.

Relevant facts emerging during the Hearing, Discussion and Decision

The Complainant was not present in spite of a written notice having been sent to him. The Respondents stated that the RTI application dated 17.11.2015 was responded to on 27.11.2015 and the information was denied because it pertained to the accounts of a third party and the Complainant had not submitted an authorization from the account holder to get the information. Subsequently, the Complainant reminded the bank on 5.1.2016, stating that he had received no reply. Therefore, another copy of the reply dated 27.11.2015 was sent to him on 5.2.2016, but it was received back undelivered from the postal authorities.

2. In the light of the records placed before us and the above submissions of the Respondents, we find no substance in these complaints and the two complaints are dismissed.
3. 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