

Central Information Commission, New Delhi
File No. CIC/SH/A/2016/000075
Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (19)

Date of hearing : 19th January 2017

Date of decision : 19th January 2017

Name of the Appellant : SHRI AJAY PAL MEENA
C-21, MAHAL YOJNA, JAGATPURA,
JAIPUR RAJASTHAN

Name of the Public Authority/Respondent : CENTRAL PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER,
INDIAN OVERSEAS BANK
REGIONAL OFFICE, JAIPUR, S B-
57, 1ST FLOOR, RIDHI TOWER,
OPPOSITE SAWAI MAN SINGH
STADIUM (EAST GATE), TONK
ROAD, JAIPUR- 302 015

RTI Application filed on : 27/09/2014

CPIO replied on : 13/10/2014

First Appeal filed on : —

First Appellate Authority order on : —

2nd Appeal received on : 12/03/2015

The Appellant was present at the NIC Studio, Jaipur.

On behalf of the Respondents, Shri Mahender Kumar Grahwal, Law Officer was present at the NIC Studio, Jaipur.

Information Commissioner : Shri Sharat Sabharwal

Information sought

This matter concerns an RTI application filed by the Appellant, seeking information on four points regarding copies of correspondence and details of phone calls made between the Regional office and Branch Head from 9.5.2014 to 19.6.2014, details of the action taken against the then Branch Head for not submitting CAF returns, dates on which the then Branch Head had submitted CAF returns and correspondences made

between the Regional office and Branch Head in respect of CAF returns for the months of August and November 2013.

The CPIO reply

The CPIO denied the information under section 8 (1) (d), (e), (g) & (j) of the RTI Act. He also stated that the information sought was not available in the form in which it was sought and its collection and compilation would disproportionately divert the resources of the Public Authority.

Grounds of the First Appeal

No appeal filed.

Order of the First Appellate Authority

No order passed.

Grounds of the Second Appeal

Not satisfied with the CPIO's reply, the Appellant vide letter dated 8.12.2014, filed an appeal to the State Information Commission, Rajasthan. The SIC, Rajasthan, vide letter dated 18.2.2015, transferred the appeal to the CIC.

Relevant facts emerging during the Hearing, Discussion and Decision

The Appellant stated that the bank issued a notice to him, alleging that when he was incharge of a branch during the period 9.5.2014 to 19.6.2014, he failed to file certain returns to the Regional Office. He claimed that he was on medical leave during the above period and another officer was incharge of the branch. The Respondents reiterated the reply of the CPIO.

2. We have considered the submissions of both the parties and note that the Appellant has sought elaborate and, in one case, non-specific information under four points regarding the correspondence and phone calls between the branch and the Regional Office and some related issues. He has given no cogent reason for disclosure of such elaborate and non- specific information to him. He claims that he needs it to answer the show cause notice issued to him by the bank, but has stated that he was on medical leave during that period. If his claim regarding his medical leave is true, that would constitute a straightforward response to the notice.

3. In view of the foregoing, we find no substance in this appeal and it is dismissed.

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