

केन्द्रीय सूचना आयोग  
Central Information Commission  
बाबा गंगनाथ मार्ग, मुनिरका  
Baba Gangnath Marg, Munirka  
नई दिल्ली, New Delhi – 110067

शिकायत संख्या / Complaint No. **CIC/IGCAR/C/2020/684302**

Shri G Saravanan

शिकायतकर्ता / Complainant

VERSUS/बनाम

PIO/Administrative Officer-III,  
(R&V) Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research  
Through: Smt. S Jayakumari - CPIO

...प्रतिवादीगण / Respondent

Date of Hearing : 30.03.2022

Date of Decision : 31.03.2022

**Chief Information Commissioner : Shri Y. K. Sinha**

**Relevant facts emerging from complaint:**

RTI application filed on : 23.07.2020

PIO replied on : 21.08.2020

First Appeal filed on : -

First Appellate Order on : -

2<sup>nd</sup>Appeal/complaint dated : 03.09.2020

**Information sought and background of the case:**

The Complainant filed an RTI application dated 23.07.2020 which was responded to by the CPIO vide letter dated 21.08.2020 as under:-

SL.No.	INFORMATION SOUGHT	INFORMATION PROVIDED
1.	Provide monthly wise number of workers working in the contract awarded to the Private Contractor from last (01/05/2016 to 31/05/2020) on behalf of Kalpakkam Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research (IGCAR)	
2.	Provide name list information related to the work of Principal Employees of Kalpakkam Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research (IGCAR).	

3.	Provide Information lists of Engineer in charge assignments and assignments to be awarded to a Private company on behalf of Kalpakkam Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research (IGCAR).	The information sought by you is not specific and in general in nature , as the same does not indicate the particular contract details like tender/work order number issued to the contractor required by you. Hence it is unable to provide the information sought under RTI Act, 2005. However, it is requested to give specific details of contract/tender/work order / Engineer-in-charge who issued the contract/ tender/work order so as to provide the information under RTI Act.
4.	Provide name list of Information files and files to be inspected by Engineer in charge on behalf of the Government on behalf of a Private contractor awarded on behalf of Kalpakkam Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research (IGCAR).	
5.	Provide in the Tender number issued on behalf of Kalpakkam Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research (IGCAR) from last (01/05/2015 to 31/05/2020) LI give the list information related to the amount awarded to the Private Contractor, the name of the work, the tender number and the name of the Private Company, office address.	
6.	Provide monthly information on the total number of tenders awarded to a Private contractor on behalf of Kalpakkam Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research (IGCAR) from last (01/05/2015 to 31/05/2020) last.	

Aggrieved and dissatisfied, the Complainant approached the Commission with the instant Complaint.

**Facts emerging in Course of Hearing:**

A written submission has been received from CPIO, Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research vide letter dated 24.03.2022, reiterating the response furnished to the Complainant and placing reliance on a recent decision of this Bench in a batch of case nos. CIC/IGCAR/C/2020/676880, CIC/IGCAR/A/2020/682518, CIC/IGCAR/A/2020/67806, CIC/IGCAR/C/2020/682754 and CIC/IGCAR/A/2020/688862 dated 15.02.2022 filed by an Appellant named R Gopinath. Relevant contentions from the Respondent’s submission are as follows:

- a) The appellant in his RTI application dated 23.07.2020 is seeking information which doesn't specify any tender/work order number/Engineer-in-charge. The appellant was asked to give specific details of contract/tender/work order/Engineer-in-charge who issued the contract/tender/work order so as to provide the information under RTI Act., but the appellant did not provide any of the above. Instead he has resorted to file a complaint directly to CIC, New Delhi and then forwarded his complaint letter to the First Appellate Authority seeking for response. First Appellate Authority vide his Order dated 27.10.2020 has informed that he agrees with the reply of the CPIO provided to the appellant as tender no./work order no./Engineer-in-charge was not specified to provide the requisite information.

- b) Section 6(1) of the RTI Act clearly states that a person desirous of obtaining information shall specify the particulars of the information sought by him. The nature of queries and the information sought are such that promotion of self-interest, rather than public interest, is dominant. The information sought is not available at one place. Collection and collation of this information for the purpose of providing the same under RTI would result in the Public Authority getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information and to the detriment of considering more important and time bound issues. Despite requesting him to specify the particulars of the information required by him he has failed to do so. He has thus demonstrated that he is a non-serious information seeker with an intent to use it for personal interest and relentlessly submerge the normal functioning of the Public Authority under a deluge of irrelevant paperwork. The Appellant appears to be doing so despite the express knowledge of the fact that he is pursuing a matter of no larger public interest, rather the public authority is being unabashedly harassed by filing vexatious RTI Applications.
- c) CIC in the case of CBSE & another vs Aditya Bandopadhyay & ors has quoted that indiscriminate & impractical demands or directions under RTI Act. for disclosure of all & sundry information would adversely affect the efficiency of the administration & result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting & furnishing information.
- 5) In the recent CIC decision dated 16.02.2022 in the case of Shri R.Gopinath vs IGCAR, Kalpakkam, for seeking information without providing details, CIC has conveyed their decision that the appellant cannot overload a public authority and divert its resources disproportionately while seeking information and that the dispensation of information should not occupy the majority of time and resource of any public authority, as it would be against the larger public interest.

In order to ensure social distancing and prevent the spread of the pandemic, COVID-19, hearing was scheduled through video conference after giving prior notice to both the parties. Respondent alone is present for the hearing held through video conference while the Complainant has not attended the hearing despite service of hearing notice in advance, nor has he sent any communication explaining the cause of his absence.

### **Decision**

Upon perusal of the records of case and examining the facts of the case, the Commission finds no lacuna in the reply furnished by the Respondent. The instant case is a Complaint filed u/s 18 of the RTI Act, 2005 where the Commission is only required to ascertain if the information has been denied with any *malafide* intention or without any reasonable cause. Perusal of records of the case reveals that there has been no such deliberate denial or suppression of information, in contravention of the provisions of the RTI Act. In view of the unexplained absence of the Complainant it is not possible to ascertain his current views about the matter.

In the light of the above facts, the Commission finds no reason for intervention under the RTI Act, in this case. The case is disposed off accordingly.

**Y. K. Sinha** (वाई. के. सिन्हा)  
Chief Information Commissioner (सूचना आयुक्त)

Authenticated true copy  
(अभिप्रमाणित सत्यापित प्रति)

S. K. Chitkara (एस. के. चिटकारा)  
Dy. Registrar (उप-पंजीयक)  
011-26186535

