

Central Information Commission, New Delhi  
File No. CIC/SH/C/2016/000077  
File No. CIC/SH/C/2016/000151  
Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (18)

Date of hearing : 15th March 2017

Date of decision : 15th March 2017

Name of the Complainant : SHRI PRAHLAD VERMA

Name of the Public Authority/Respondent : CENTRAL PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER,  
ALLAHABAD BANK  
NEAR BUS STATION, BEHRAICH  
ROAD, GONDA, UP

The Complainant was present at the NIC Studio, Gonda.

On behalf of the Respondents, Shri A. S. Hira, AGM was present at the NIC Studio, Gonda.

Information Commissioner : Shri Sharat Sabharwal

These files contain two complaints in respect of the RTI applications dated 30.11.2015 (file No. 77) and 25.2.2016 (File No. 151), filed by the Complainant, seeking information regarding a loan request of his proprietary firm Hira Brickfield. Not satisfied with the response of the Respondents, he has approached the CIC in complaint in both the cases.

2. The Complainant stated that he had applied for a loan of Rs. 15 lakhs and offered a security of Rs. 18 lakhs. However, a loan of Rs. 8 lakhs only was sanctioned three months after he made the application. He wants to know the reasons for not sanctioning the full amount of Rs. 15 lakhs.

3. The Respondents stated that a reply to the RTI application dated 30.11.2015 was sent on 11.1.2016 and the Complainant was informed that information had already been provided on 15.12.2015. The application dated 25.2.2016 was responded

to on 11.3.2016. They further submitted that the Complainant had filed a court case also in the matter. The Respondents also stated that another application of the Complainant, seeking information concerning the same loan application, was considered and disposed of by the Commission vide order No. CIC/SH/C/2014/000359 dated 25.5.2016.

4. We have considered the records and the submissions of both the parties. It is noted that for the reasons stated in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the above mentioned order dated 25.5.2016 of the Commission, we had made the following observations in paragraph 4 of the said order:-

*“It would, therefore, appear that the Complainant has sought to use his complaint to the Commission to pressurise the bank authorities into giving him certain loan facilities. Moreover, the FAA has also enclosed a letter dated 28.1.2014 addressed by the Complainant to the Branch Manager in which he stated that he had no complaint against the bank and his complaints and RTI request to the bank, made in the past, should be considered as cancelled.”*

5. In view of the foregoing, we do not consider it necessary to enquire further into the two complaints before us today.

6. With the above observations, the two complaints are disposed of.

7. 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**