

केन्द्रीय सूचना आयोग
Central Information Commission
बाबागंगनाथमार्ग, मुनिरका
Baba Gangnath Marg, Munirka
नईदिल्ली, New Delhi – 110067

द्वितीय अपील संख्या / Second Appeal No. **CIC/IGCAR/C/2020/676880**
शिकायतसंख्या / Complaint No. **CIC/IGCAR/A/2020/682518**
CIC/IGCAR/A/2020/678064
CIC/IGCAR/C/2020/682754
CIC/IGCAR/A/2020/688862

शिकायतकर्ता / Complainant
Shri R Gopinath ... अपीलकर्ता / Appellant

VERSUS/बनाम
PIO ... प्रतिवादीगण / Respondent
Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research,
Tamilnadu

Date of Hearing : 15.02.2022

Date of Decision : 16.02.2022

Chief Information Commissioner : Shri Y. K. Sinha

Relevant facts emerging from appeal/complaint:

Since both the parties are same, the above mentioned cases are clubbed together for hearing and disposal.

Case No.	RTI Filed on	CPIO reply	First appeal	FAO	2 nd Appeal /Complaint dated
676880	11.05.2020	25.06.2020	10.06.2020	-	05.07.2020
682518	11.05.2020	25.06.2020	10.06.2020	18.08.2020	20.08.2020
678064	08.02.2020	12.06.2020	09.03.2020	21.05.2020 and 22.06.2020	15.07.2020
682754	13.07.2020	17.08.2020	-	-	22.08.2020
688862	13.07.2020	17.08.2020	24.08.2020	01.10.2020	12.10.2020

Information sought and background of the case:

- (1) CIC/IGCAR/C/2020/676880**
- (2) CIC/IGCAR/A/2020/682518**

The Complainant/Appellant filed an RTI application dated 11.05.2020 which was replied to by the CPIO/Administrative Officer-III(R&V), vide letter dated 25.06.2020 as under:-

SL.No.	INFORMATION SOUGHT	INFORMATION PROVIDED
	Reference: M/s. Ganesh Contract, Air Conditioning & Refrigeration Services, Sadras Village, Kalpakkam – 603102.	The information sought is general and vague in nature. Hence it is unable to provide the information sought under RTI Act, 2005.
1.	Kindly provide the copies of the registers/documents/files related to the issue of the tender and name of the work given to the above contract company provided by IGCAR during the period from 23.03.2010 to 28.11.2019.	
2.	Kindly provide the copies of the registers/documents/files related to the cheques issued to the above contract company during the period from 28.04.2010 to 31.12.2019.	
3.	Kindly provide the copies of the registers/documents/files related to the name of the workers, their designation working in the above contract company in IGCAR during the period from 23.03.2010 to 28.11.2019	

Dissatisfied with the reply received from the CPIO, the Appellant filed a First Appeal dated 10.06.2020. The FAA, Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research, Kalpakkam vide order dated 18.08.2020 held as under:-

2.2 As regards, the reply to the queries of your RTI application dated 11.05.2020, I observe that the information sought by you is in general terms, as the same does not indicate the information like tender no., date, etc., required by you specifically. However, keeping the spirit of RTI Act, CPIO, IGCAR is being advised to provide the information/documents to you on receipt of specific details about tender/work order no., details of concerned Engineer-in-Charge from you, free of cost. You are therefore advised to give specific details of tender/work order no. , name of Engineer-in-charge etc., to CPIO, IGCAR in order to enable him to furnish information/documents under RTI.

Feeling aggrieved and dissatisfied, the Appellant approached the Commission with the instant Second Appeal/Complaint.

(3) CIC/IGCAR/A/2020/678064

The Appellant filed an RTI application dated 08.02.2020 seeking information on the following 10 points regarding tender no WO/2017/1763:-

1. kindly provide the details of the officer (Name, Designation, Telephone no, e-mail) who evaluated the Contractors with respect to the above mentioned tender.
2. kindly provide the copies of the Comparative statement and 'L1' and the work order issued to the contractor with respect to the above tender.
3. kindly provide the copies of the documents of the wage register from the date of issue of the above work order till the date of closure with respect to the salary issued to the workers.
4. kindly provide the copies of the documents pertaining to the PF & ES I nos, of the workers and the work order from the date of issue of work order till the closure.
5. kindly provide the documents related to the 19D (Charge form (monthly wise) issued by the employer to the Engineer - in - charge (Government officer).
6. kindly provide the copy of the terms and condition, special instruction to the tenders and Requirements and Eligibility Criteria issued to the Contractors with respect to the above tender.

ETC.

Having not received a response from the CPIO, the Appellant filed a First Appeal dated 09.03.2020. The FAA, IGCAR, Kalapakkam vide order dated 21.05.2020 held as under:-

2.1 I have gone through your appeal dated 09.03.2020 stating that reply to your RTI application dated 08.02.2020 was not provided. It is observed that though your appeal dated 09.03.2020 is addressed to the Appellate Authority, IGCAR, the same was received in another office viz., BARC(F), Kalpakkam and the same was forwarded by Chief Administrative Officer, BARCF to the Appellate Authority, IGCAR vide note dated 23.03.2020, received in IGCAR on 08.05.2020. On receipt of your appeal, I have made enquiry with CPIO, IGCAR who has stated that your RTI application dated 08.02.2020 has not been received by him. Therefore, I am forwarding a copy of your RTI application dated 08.02.2020 to the CPIO, IGCAR for further action under the RTI Act.

In compliance with the FAA's order dated 21.05.2020, the CPIO/Administrative Officer-III(R&V), IGCAR, Kalapakkam vide letter dated 12.06.2020 replied as

under:-

Sl. No.	INFORMATION SOUGHT	INFORMATION PROVIDED
	Reference: 1. Tender no.: Work order No: WO/2017/1763	
1.	Kindly provide the details of the Officer (Name, Designation, Telephone no., e-mail) who evaluated the contractors with respect to the above mentioned tender.	The information sought by you is personal information and the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest or which would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the individual. Hence, exempted under Section 8(1) (j) of RTI Act, 2005.
9.	Kindly provide the copies of the documents of the "Principle employer" and "Labour Enforcement Officer" who had verified the salary issued to the workers as per minimum wages Act 1948 & Contract Labour Act 1970 in respect of the work order from the date of issue of work order till the closure of the work order.	
2.	Kindly provide the copies of the comparative statement and 'LI' and the work order issued to the contractor with respect to the above tender.	
3.	Kindly provide the copies of the documents of the wage register from the date of issue of the above work order till the date of closure with respect to the salary issued to the workers.	
4.	Kindly provide the copies of the documents pertaining to the PF & ESI nos., of the workers and the amount recovered towards the PF & ESI in respect of the work order from the date of issue of work order till the closure.	
10.	Kindly provide the copy of the Insurance policy issued to the contract workers working in the above job.	The copies of the registers/documents containing 12 pages is provided free of cost.
		As regards of the information relating to the documents of the wage registers, PF & ESI nos. of the workers and Insurance Policy issued to the contract workers being the Third Party information under Section 11 of RTI Act, M/s. Ganesh Air-conditioning & Refrigeration Service was sought whether such information can be disclosed to the applicant. M/s. Ganesh Air-conditioning & Refrigeration Service has informed that the documents sought under the RTI, is the legal information/confidential of the company and the same shall not be disclosed to the applicant. Considering the above, the information sought is denied and is exempted under Section 8(1) (d) of RTI Act, 2005.

ETC.

In the meanwhile, the Appellant filed another First Appeal dated 07.05.2020. The FAA, vide order dated 22.06.2020 stated as under:-

2. I have gone through your appeal dated 07.05.2020 received on 29.05.2020 stating that reply to your RTI application dated 08.02.2020 and appeal dated 09.03.2020 were not provided. I observe that your appeal dated 09.03.2020 received on 08.05.2020 has already been disposed of vide letter no. IGCAR/2(7)/2020-21/Admn(Vig)/646 dated 21.05.2020 with a direction to the CPIO to dispose of your RTI application dated 08.02.2020. I also observe that CPIO, IGCAR furnished an interim reply to you vide letter no. IGCAR/2(7)/2020-21/Admn(Vig)/659 dated 05.06.2020 stating that due to the prevailing situation of COVID 19 pandemic, limited officials are working and information has been called for from concerned officers and the same will be furnished shortly. I further observed that CPIO, IGCAR had subsequently provided certain information/documents free of cost vide letter no. IGCAR/2(7)/2020-21 Admn(Vig)/667 dated 12.06.2020 sent to you through email dated 16.06.2020 as well as through speed post In view of the fact that the CPIO had already disposed of your RTI application dated 08.02.2020, I find no reason to interfere in the matter at this stage.

Feeling aggrieved and dissatisfied, the Appellant approached the Commission with the instant Second Appeal.

- (4) **CIC/IGCAR/C/2020/682754**
(5) **CIC/IGCAR/A/2020/688862**

The Complainant/Appellant filed an RTI application dated 13.07.2020 which was replied to by the CPIO/Administrative Officer-III(R&V), IGCAR, Kalapakkam videletter dated 17.08.2020 as under:-

SL.No.	INFORMATION SOUGHT	INFORMATION PROVIDED
	Reference: 1. Tender no.: Work order No: 2018/2697	
1.	Please kindly provide the copy of the terms and conditions special instruction to the tenders and requirements and eligibility criteria issued to the contractors with respect to the above tender.	The copies of the registers/documents containing 20 pages is provided free of cost.
2.	Please kindly provide the details of the officer (Name, Designation) and (Telephone no, e-mail id) who evaluated the contractors with respect to the above mentioned tender.	The information sought by you is personal information and the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest or which would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the individual. Hence, exempted under Section 8(1) (j) of RTI Act, 2005.
7.	Please kindly provide the copies of the documents of the "Principle employer" and "Labour Enforcement Officer" who had verified the salary issued to the workers as per minimum wages Act 1948 & Contract Labour Act 1970 in respect of the work order from the date of issue till 30/06/2020.	
03.	Please kindly provide the copies of the below mentioned "Mandatory documents" of the assessed tenders submitted by the contractors.	The assessed tenders were submitted by the below mentioned contractors. (i)M/s. Ganesh Air conditioning & Refrigeration Services, Sadras. (ii) M/s. Sakthi Engineers, Sadras. (iii) M/s. Genius Aircon Pvt. Ltd., Chennai (iv) M/s. Lotus Air tech Engg. Pvt Ltd., Chennai
	i). Completion certificate of previous work order.	
	ii). 40%, 60% & 80% estimated cost of previous work details	The copies of the registers/documents containing 03 pages is provided free of cost.
	vi). Bidding capacity	



	iii). Last three financial year average annual turn over (gross) of estimated cost.	As regards of the information relating to documents of the Query nos. 03 (iii), (iv), (v) & (vii), being the Third Party information under Section 11 of RTI Act, M/s. Ganesh Air-conditioning & Refrigeration Service was sought whether such information can be disclosed to the applicant. M/s. Ganesh Air-conditioning & Refrigeration Service has informed that the documents sought under the RTI, is the legal information/confidential of the company and the same shall not be disclosed to the applicant. Considering the above, the information sought is denied and is exempted under Section 8(1) (d) of RTI Act, 2005.
	iv). Profit, loss details of last five years.	
	v). Company registration certificates	
	vii). GST, PF and ESI registration details	
	viii) Performance certificate of previous work orders	The information sought is not available
4.	Please kindly provide the copies of the comparative statement and L1 and the work order issued to the contractor with respect to the above tender.	The copies of the registers/documents containing 04 pages is provided free of cost.
5.	Please kindly provide the copies of the documents related to the work order, no., of workers appointed from the date of issue of work order till 30/06/2020, their minimum educational qualification, documents submitted by the workers, details of the officers (Name, Designation, Telephone no., e-mail id) who appointed the workers.	The copies of the registers/documents containing 01 page is provided free of cost. (The referred work order is valid up to 03.12.2019 only) No documents have been submitted by the workers to the department. The information sought by you is personal information and the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest or which would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the individual. Hence, exempted under Section 8(1) (j) of RTI Act, 2005.
6.	Please kindly provide the copies of the documents of the wage register from the date of issue of the above work order till 30/06/2020), with respect to the salary issued to the workers.	The information relating to the documents of the wage registers, PF & ESI nos of the workers and insurance policy issued to the contract workers being the Third Party information under section 11 of the RTI Act. M/s. Ganesh Air-conditioning and refrigeration service was sought whether such information can be disclosed to the applicant. M/s. Ganesh Air-conditioning & Refrigeration service has informed that the documents sought under the RTI, is the legal information/confidential of the company and the same shall not be disclosed to the applicant. Considering the above, the information sought is denied and is exempted under Section 8(1) (d) of RTI Act, 2005.
8.	Please kindly provide the copies of the documents pertaining to the PF & ESI nos. of the workers and the amount recovered towards the PF & ESI in respect of the work order from the date of issue till 30/06/2020.	
9.	Please kindly provide the copies of the Insurance Policy issued to the contract workers working in the above tender job.	
10.	Please kindly provide the documents related to the 19 D (Clause) form (monthly wise) issued by the employer to the Engineer – in- charge.	
		The copies of the registers/documents containing 24 pages is provided free of cost.

Dissatisfied with the reply received from the CPIO, the Appellant filed a First Appeal dated 24.08.2020. The FAA, vide order dated 01.10.2020 upheld the reply of the CPIO for points 1,3,4,5,6,8 and 9, For point no. 2 and 7 it was held as under:-

SL. No.	INFORMATION SOUGHT	INFORMATION PROVIDED BY CPIO	OBSERVATIONS OF THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
02.	Please kindly provide the details of the officer (Name, Designation) and (Telephone no, e-mail id) who evaluated the contractors with respect to the above mentioned tender.	The information sought by you is personal information and the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest or which would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the individual. Hence, exempted under Section 8(1) (j) of RTI Act, 2005.	I have gone through your RTI application and also the reply furnished by CPIO. As regards reply to question No. 2 is concerned, I am of the opinion that the details such as names and designation of the official who evaluated the tenders is not a personal information and as such, CPIO is directed to supply this information to the Appellant within 5 working days.
07.	Please kindly provide the copies of the documents of the "Principle employer" and "Labour Enforcement Officer" who had verified the salary issued to the workers as per minimum wages Act 1948 & Contract Labour Act 1970 in respect of the work order from the date of issue till 30/06/2020.		As regards question No. 7 is concerned, the question is vague. Therefore, I find no reason to interfere with the reply of the CPIO.

Feeling aggrieved and dissatisfied, the Appellant/Complainant approached the Commission with the instant Second Appeal/Complaint.

Facts emerging in Course of Hearing:

A written submission has been received from Smt Jucy Jacob, AO-III, Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research (IGCAR), Kalapakkam on 14.02.2022 and the same has been taken on record.

The Appellant/Complainant alongwith his representative, Shri Tamil, participated in the hearing through audio conference. Shri Tamil stated that point wise information was not provided by the Respondent.

The Respondent represented by Smt Jayakumari, AO, IGCAR, Kalapakkam participated in the hearing through audio conference. At the outset she tendered an unconditional apology for the delay in sending the written submission and assured the Commission that in future they would ensure that the submissions are sent well in advance for its consideration. With respect to substantive aspects of all the matters under consideration she stated that the Appellant/ Complainant has filed multiple RTI applications essentially seeking vague and roving information relating to M/s Ganesh Contract Air Conditioning and Engineering Services. She further stated that inspection of records was offered to the Appellant which he did not avail. On being queried by the Commission regarding the reasons for denial of information on point no 1 under consideration in Second Appeal No CIC/IGCAR/A/2020/678064 and point no 2 under consideration in Second Appeal No CIC/IGCAR/C/2020/682754 and CIC/IGCAR/A/2020/688862, no satisfactory response was offered by the Respondent who stated that composition of the committee evaluating tenders undergoes changes from time to time and members retire periodically. She also feigned ignorance regarding compliance of the FAA's order directing disclosure of information on point no 2 in Second Appeal No CIC/IGCAR/C/2020/682754 and CIC/IGCAR/A/2020/688862.

Decision

Keeping in view the facts of the case and the submissions made by both the parties, the Commission at the outset observes that all the instant Second

Appeal/ Complaints under consideration herein emanate from the same issue relating to Appellant/ Complainant's grievance against M/s Ganesh Contract Air Conditioning and Engineering Services. Similar Second Appeals/ Complaints filed against BARC have already been heard by this bench in
CIC/BARKP/A/2020/677771, CIC/BARKP/A/2020/679891
CIC/BARKP/A/2020/695737, CIC/BARKP/A/2020/680749
CIC/BARKP/A/2020/681067, CIC/BARKP/A/2020/686161
CIC/BARKP/C/2020/677592, CIC/BARKP/A/2020/688860 and
CIC/BARKP/C/2020/681860 decided on 03.06.2021 where the Commission allowed inspection of documents to the Appellant/ Complainant and also observed that redressal of grievance of the Appellant/ Complainant against M/s Ganesh Contract Air Conditioning and Engineering Services is outside the jurisdiction of the Commission for which he should approach an appropriate forum. The factual background behind filing of the RTI application was also mentioned in the aforementioned decision as under:

“The Appellant was working as Plant Operator in BARC under M/s Ganesh Engineering and has been removed from the job – The appellant sent a letter to BARC authorities on 03.02.2020 for taking necessary action against the Contractor who removed him from his job without any information and for not giving him PF/ESI and other benefits for work done by him.”

Having heard the Appellant/ Complainant, the Commission finds that he has filed a series of similar RTI applications before multiple public authorities thereby abusing the RTI mechanism in order to get his personal grievances redressed.

Even if the Commission were to reluctantly acknowledge that this is an attempt on the Appellant/ Complainant's part to fight corruption, the means adopted by him stifles and defeats the very purpose of the RTI Act. In other words, however noble the purpose of this vigorous attempt to bring about probity in the functioning of the public authorities would have been, the fact remains that the means adopted by him by inundating the Public Authority with multiple RTI cases unfortunately only points to the ignorance of the Appellant/ Complainant about the spirit of the RTI Act. As much as a CPIO has a statutory responsibility of complying with the provisions of the RTI Act, it is also expected of the RTI Applicant/s to not undermine the spirit of the RTI Act by clogging the system with such a barrage of RTI applications, merely claiming that these are aimed in larger public interest.

The Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the case of Public Information Officer, Registrar (Administration) Vs B Bharathi[WP No. 26781/2013 dated 17.09.2014] has also given its opinion about such vexatious litigation crippling the public authorities and held as follows:

*“...The action of the second respondent in sending numerous complaints and representations and then following the same with the RTI applications; that it cannot be the way to redress his grievance; that **he 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.....”

Emphasis supplied

The Hon'ble Delhi High Court while deciding the case of ShailSahni vs. Sanjeev Kumar &Ors. [W.P. (C) 845/2014] has observed that:

“.....Consequently, this Court deems it appropriate to refuse to exercise its writ jurisdiction. Accordingly, present petition is dismissed. This Court is also of the view that misuse of the RTI Act has to be appropriately dealt with, otherwise the public would lose faith and confidence in this “sunshine Act”. A beneficial Statute, when made a tool for mischief and abuse must be checked in accordance with law.”

Emphasis supplied

In the matter of Rajni Maindiratta- Vs Directorate of Education (North West-B) [W.P.(C) No. 7911/2015] the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, vide its order dated 08.10.2015 has held that:

“8.Though undoubtedly, the reason for seeking the information is not required to be disclosed but when it is found that the process of the law is being abused, the same become relevant. Neither the authorities created under the RTI Act nor the Courts are helpless if witness the provisions of law being abused and owe a duty to immediately put a stop thereto...”

The aforesaid dicta essentially prove that the misuse of RTI Act is a well recognized problem and citizens such as the Appellant/ Complainant should take note that their right to information is not absolute.

The Apex Court in a vital decision has categorically cautioned thus:

*“...The RTI Act provides access to all information that is available and existing. This is clear from a combined reading of Section 3 and the definitions of 'information' and 'right to information' under Clauses (f) and (j) of Section 2 of the Act. If a public authority has any information in the form of data or analysed data, or abstracts, or statistics, an applicant may access such information, subject to the exemptions in Section 8 of the Act. But where the information sought is not a part of the record of a public authority, and where such information is not required to be maintained under any law or the rules or regulations of the public authority, the Act does not cast an obligation upon the public authority, to collect or collate such non-available information and then furnish it to an applicant. The right to information is a fundamental right as enshrined in Article 19 of the Constitution of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has declared in a plethora of cases that the most important value for the functioning of a healthy and well-informed democracy is transparency. However it is necessary to make a distinction in regard to information intended to bring transparency, to improve accountability and to reduce corruption, falling under Section 4(1)(b) and (c) and other information which may not have a bearing on accountability or reducing corruption. The competent authorities under the RTI Act will have to maintain a proper balance so that while achieving transparency, **the demand for***

information does not reach unmanageable proportions affecting other public interests, which include efficient operation of public authorities and government, preservation of confidentiality of sensitive information and optimum use..” (The Institute of Chartered Accountants of India Vs. Shaunak H. Satya and Ors, A.I.R 2011 SC 3336).

Emphasis supplied

In the other landmark judgement in the case of Central Board of Secondary Education &Anr. Vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay&Ors., the Apex Court held as follows:

“...The Act seeks to bring about a balance between two conflicting interests, as harmony between them is essential for preserving democracy. One is to bring about transparency and accountability by providing access to information under the control of public authorities. The other is **to ensure that the revelation of information, in actual practice, does not conflict with other public interests which include efficient operation of the governments, optimum use of limited fiscal resources** and preservation of confidentiality of sensitive information. The preamble to the Act specifically states that the object of the Act is to harmonise these two conflicting interest.
.....

37. The right to information is a cherished right. Information and right to information are intended to be formidable tools in the hands of responsible citizens to fight corruption and to bring in transparency and accountability..... **Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counter-productive as it will adversely affect the efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information. The Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens. Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties..”**

The Commission observed that the framework of the RTI Act, 2005 restricts the jurisdiction of the Commission to provide a ruling on the issues pertaining to access/ right to information and not to venture into the merits of a case or redressal of grievance. The Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in the matter of Union of India v. Namit Sharma in REVIEW PETITION [C] No.2309 OF 2012 IN Writ Petition [C] No.210 OF 2012 with State of Rajasthan and Anr. vs. Namit Sharma Review Petition [C] No.2675 OF 2012 In Writ Petition [C] No.210 OF 2012 had held as under:

“While deciding whether a citizen should or should not get a particular information “which is held by or under the control of any public authority”, the Information Commission does not decide a dispute between two or more

parties concerning their legal rights other than their right to get information in possession of a public authority. This function obviously is not a judicial function, but an administrative function conferred by the Act on the Information Commissions.”

Furthermore, the High Court of Delhi in the matter of Hansi Rawat and Anr. vs. Punjab National Bank and Ors. LPA No.785/2012 dated 11.01.2013 held as under:

*“6. The proceedings under the RTI Act do not entail detailed adjudication of the said aspects. The dispute relating to dismissal of the appellant No.2 LPA No.785/2012 from the employment of the respondent Bank is admittedly pending consideration before the appropriate forum. The purport of the RTI Act is to enable the appellants to effectively pursue the said dispute. The question, as to what inference if any is to be drawn from the response of the PIO of the respondent Bank to the RTI application of the appellants, **is to be drawn in the said proceedings and as aforesaid the proceedings under the RTI Act cannot be converted into proceedings for adjudication of disputes as to the correctness of the information furnished.”***

Having said that, the Commission is of the view that information on point no 1 of the RTI application under consideration in Second Appeal no. CIC/IGCAR/A/2020/678064 and point no 2 under consideration in Second Appeal nos. CIC/IGCAR/C/2020/682754 and CIC/IGCAR/A/2020/688862 should be provided to the Appellant/ Complainant since it pertains to an official duty performed by a government employee. The above mentioned direction should be complied with by 15.03.2022 under intimation to the Commission. No malafide intent can be attributed to the conduct of the CPIO for which penal action u/s 20 (1) of the RTI Act can be invoked.

The Commission also advises the Appellant/ Complainant to abstain from filing multiple RTI applications on similar issues essentially related to his grievance redressal. Furthermore, based on the facts and circumstances of other matters the Commission may dispose off the other Second Appeals/ Complaints without issuing separate notice of hearing in case the information sought in such matters is similar/ related to the information sought in the instant matters.

The instant Second Appeals/ Complaints stand disposed off accordingly.

Y. K. Sinha (वाई. के. सिन्हा)

Chief Information Commissioner (मुख्य सूचना आयुक्त)

Authenticated true copy
(अभिप्रमाणित सत्यापित प्रति)

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