

Central Information Commission, New Delhi
File No. CIC/SH/A/2016/000069
Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (19)

Date of hearing : 16th January 2017

Date of decision : 16th January 2017

Name of the Appellant : SHRI N.VENKATA SUBBIAH
HOUSE NO.8-1-284/OU/473,
O U COLONY SHAIKPET,
HYDERABAD-500008

Name of the Public Authority/Respondent : CENTRAL PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER,
CANARA BANK
CIRCLE OFFICE, 3-5-879, RUBY
HOUSE, OPP: OLD MLA QUARTERS,
HIMAVATHNAGAR, HYDERABAD- 29

RTI Application filed on : 30/07/2015

CPIO replied on : —

First Appeal filed on : 01/09/2015

First Appellate Authority order on : —

2nd Appeal received on : 16/12/2015

The Appellant was present at the NIC Studio, Rangareddy.

On behalf of the Respondents, Shri P. V. Nadamuni, CPIO was present at the NIC Studio, Rangareddy.

Information Commissioner : Shri Sharat Sabharwal

Information sought

1. Account wise direct liabilities standing in his name at the time of ceasing from the service under SVRs - 2000 and their due and dates as per the sanction terms and conditions for clearing each liability.

2. Account wise indirect liability if any and their due dates as per the sanction terms and conditions for clearing the liability by the borrower guarantor.
3. Copies of proceedings issued for clearance of the liabilities.

Apart from the above, the Appellant also sought some information regarding any directive from the RBI and or guidelines issued by the Respondents as terms and conditions for sanction of loan/ credit facility to a pensioner drawing monthly pension of Rs. 4,840/-.

The CPIO reply

No reply given.

Grounds of the First Appeal

No information provided.

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 received no response to his RTI application. The Respondents submitted that the information was not received from the branch concerned. However, it has now been received. The representative of the Respondents stated that he was carrying a copy of the information with him and

would hand it over to the Appellant at the end of the proceedings. He assured us that the name, designation and address of the First Appellate Authority was mentioned in the information that was being given to the Appellant.

2. We have considered the submissions of both the parties and take a dim view of the CPIO not having responded to the RTI application so far. In case, the CPIO refers an application to the office concerned that is the custodian of information, it is for him to follow up the matter so as to respond to the application within the period specified in the RTI Act. The CPIO is directed to adhere strictly to the time-frame laid down in the RTI Act in such matters in future. It is noted that the information is now being provided to the Appellant. The Appellant shall be at liberty to resort to the appeals process under Section 19 of the RTI Act, in case he is not satisfied with the information provided to him by the CPIO.

3. With the above 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