

## Information- Exempted

---

S. No.	Questions	Reply	Court/CIC decision
<b>A</b>	<b><u>Information to be denied under section 7(9)</u></b>		
1.	Whether voluminous information to be provided?	<b>No</b> (Inspection should be given if document is available with PIO)	<p>Central Board of Secondary Education and Anr. v. Aditya Bandopadhyay and Ors. CIVIL APPEAL NO.6454 OF 2011, Supreme Court. SLP [C] No.7526/2009, Dated 09.08.2011. <a href="http://jmi.ac.in/upload/menuupload/rti_SC_CBSE.pdf">http://jmi.ac.in/upload/menuupload/rti_SC_CBSE.pdf</a></p> <p>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. 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 threat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of a public authorities prioritizing 'information furnishing', at the cost of their normal and regular duties.</p>

## Information- Exempted

---

2.	Information regarding 63 LPG trucks, mileage details and amount paid in each case, month wise, for the period 01.01.2009 to 30.5.2013 sought from IOCL.	<b>No</b>	<p>M Sushil Kumar v. IOCL: CIC/SS/A/2013/002695/SH</p> <p>Dated 30.10.2014.</p> <p><a href="http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_SS_A_2013_002695_SH_M_141840.pdf">http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_SS_A_2013_002695_SH_M_141840.pdf</a></p> <p>Being voluminous information, it was denied under 7(9) of the RTI Act, 2005.</p>
3.	The appellant sought verification of domestic/commercial LPG connections in respect of two gas agencies, Number of connections cancelled/locked, and details of consumers booked LPG cylinders during April 2005 to November 2011 for home delivery.	<b>No</b>	<p>Girish Nautiyal vs IOCL: CIC/LS/A/2013/001174/SS, Dated 27.01.2014.</p> <p><a href="http://rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_LS_A_2013_001174_SS_M_123883.pdf">http://rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_LS_A_2013_001174_SS_M_123883.pdf</a></p> <p>Information denied on the grounds of voluminous information under the provisions of Section 7(9) of the RTI Act. However, inspection of documents should be allowed.</p>
4.	<p>The Applicant filed 4 application seeking following information: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of Class A and Class B officers who had not been transferred as per the Company's transfer policy.</li> <li>• The number of Doctors who had been appointed in the Company under physically challenged quota since 1995.</li> <li>• Copies of rules and regulations for punishment of dealers of LPG and</li> </ul>	<b>No</b>	<p>Nitesh Kumar Tripathi Vs Ministry of Youth Affairs &amp; Sports</p> <p>CIC/LS/A/2012/000938 Dated 14.03.13</p> <p><a href="http://rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_LS_A_2012_001032_M_107247.pdf">http://rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_LS_A_2012_001032_M_107247.pdf</a></p> <p>Demand for vague and omnibus information does not serve any purpose. Besides, applicant has also to keep in mind that collection, collation and transmission of information takes time and impinges on resources of the public authority.</p>

## Information- Exempted

---

	<p>other petroleum products. The number of LPG dealers who had been fined and the amount of fine charged from them etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of corrupt officers who had been investigated on charges of corruption from 2000 to 2011.</li> <li>• Numbers of casualties due to leakage of LPG pipes and cylinders during the period 1995 to 2011 and the compensation paid to the victims and so on.</li> </ul>		
<b>B</b>	<b><u>Exempted Under Section 8(1)(d)</u></b>		
5.	Whether an applicant to be allowed to inspect the files related to the Future Pipeline Project with a Foreign Country?	<b>No</b> Exempt under Section 8(1), (d) & (f) of the RTI Act.	
6.	Whether information pertaining to sales promotion to be disclosed?	<b>No</b>	<p>Amarpal Singh v. Registrar of Newspapers for India: CIC/AD/A/2010/00173, Dated 25.01.2011.</p> <p><a href="http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_AD_A_2010_001737_M_50571.pdf">http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_AD_A_2010_001737_M_50571.pdf</a></p> <p>The information relating to sales promotion schemes are exempted u/s Sec 8(1) (d) as being commercially sensitive and confidential information which could be misused to adversely affect the competitive position of third party.</p>

## Information- Exempted

---

7.	Whether information relating to the discounts given for purchases of petrol products through credit cards to be disclosed?	<b>No</b>	<p>Sh. Subhash Chandra Agrawal V M/o Petroleum &amp; Natural Gas, HPCL and BPCL:</p> <p>CIC/MA/A/2008/00068,116,523, CIC/MA/C/2008/00068.</p> <p>Dated 09.04.2008.</p> <p><a href="http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/MA-09042008-05.pdf">http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/MA-09042008-05.pdf</a></p> <p>The oil companies are commercial and service organizations. They are, therefore, free to conduct businesses in a manner that assure their competitiveness in the free market economy. For convenience, some companies have arrangements with financial institutions like banks for selling petrol through credit cards, which entitles the consumers of specific discounts. The oil companies are free to determine the extent of incentives/concessions that may be given to the consumers in the interest of promotion of business and profit motives. There is, therefore, no justification for disclosing the details of basis for providing incentives to the consumers that are critical for promotion of business.</p>
8.	Whether copies of invoices of any petroleum product sold or purchased to be provided?	<b>No</b> It would have an adverse bearing on competitiveness	
9.	Whether price structure of any product leading to disclosure of profit margin to be disclosed?	<b>No</b>	<p>Ajit Kumar v IOCL: 582/IC(A)/2007</p> <p>Dated 7.03.2007.</p> <p><a href="http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/Decision_07032007_01.pdf">http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/Decision_07032007_01.pdf</a></p> <p>The details of cost and price structure determine the profit margins of the</p>

## Information- Exempted

---

			commercial bodies and disclosure of such information would affect the commercial viability of the company, which is to compete with Oil Companies operating in both the public and the private sectors.
10	Whether information regarding reconstitution of a dealership firm by third party or by legal heirs of the deceased partners should be disclosed?	<b>No</b>	<p>Rajesh Agrawal v. BPCL: CIC/LS/A/2013/001798/SH</p> <p>Dated: 05.09.2014.</p> <p><a href="http://rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_LS_A_2013_001798_SH_M_138955.pdf">http://rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_LS_A_2013_001798_SH_M_138955.pdf</a></p> <p>CIC observed that there was a family settlement and the signatories were to apply for reconstitution of the firm, but no such request was received by the Respondents (BPCL). On the death of all the four signatories, supplies to the firm were stopped. Further, dealership is given on license basis and is not transferrable to heirs. The Appellant is son of one of the signatories. Hence, information was rightly denied under Section 8 (1) (d), treating him as third party.</p>
11	Whether signed copy of the dealership/distributorship Agreement to be given to third party?	<b>No</b>	<p>Prem Kumar v. BPCL: CIC/LS/A/2013/001007</p> <p>Dated 03.07.2013</p> <p><a href="http://rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_LS_A_2013_001007_M_115208.pdf">http://rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_LS_A_2013_001007_M_115208.pdf</a></p> <p>Commission held that copy of the Agreement between distributor and the BPCL could not be disclosed, as it was third party information.</p>

## Information- Exempted

---

12	Whether information relating to the sales figures of a particular RO to be disclosed?	<b>No</b>	<p>Shri Dinesh Sankla vs IOCL</p> <p>CIC/LS/A/2013/001128/LS</p> <p>Dated 27.01.2014</p> <p><a href="http://rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_LS_A_2013_001128_SS_M_123773.pdf">http://rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_LS_A_2013_001128_SS_M_123773.pdf</a></p> <p>(a) CIC held that sales figures in respect of RO pertain to commercial confidence, trade secrets of third party and therefore the provisions of Section 8(1) (d) and (e) would apply.</p> <p>(b) However, details of supply of petrol, diesel, oil etc. to the said retail outlet are discloseble information.</p>
13	Whether information regarding bulk sale of diesel to the specific Divisional Office to be provided?	<b>No</b>	<p>Shri Dayanand Sharma v/s IOCL</p> <p>Dated 11.08.2014</p> <p><a href="http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_LS_A_2013_001398_SH_M_137537.pdf">http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_LS_A_2013_001398_SH_M_137537.pdf</a></p> <p>CIC held that as far as bulk sale is concerned, it is made to the large industry in the area. In this case, the rate of diesel as well as the terms and conditions of sale are determined on a case to case basis between the IOCL and the concerned industry. The Appellant has not established any larger public interest for disclosure of the information. Therefore, denial of information by CPIO was held to be justified.</p>

## Information- Exempted

---

<b>C</b>	<b><u>Exempted Under Section 8(1)(e)</u></b>		
14	Whether information given by a beneficiary to the Fiduciary can be provided to the third party under the RTI Act?	<b>No</b>	<p>Central Board of Secondary Education and Anr. v. Aditya Bandopadhyay and Ors. CIVIL APPEAL NO.6454 OF 2011, Supreme Court. SLP [C] No.7526/2009, Dated 09.08.2011. <a href="http://jmi.ac.in/upload/menuupload/rti_SC_CBSE.pdf">http://jmi.ac.in/upload/menuupload/rti_SC_CBSE.pdf</a></p> <p>The term 'fiduciary relationship' is used to describe a situation or transaction where one person (beneficiary) places complete confidence in another person (fiduciary) in regard to his affairs, business or transaction/s. The term also refers to a person who holds a thing in trust for another (beneficiary). The fiduciary is expected to act in confidence and for the benefit and advantage of the beneficiary, and use good faith and fairness in dealing with the beneficiary or the things belonging to the beneficiary. If the beneficiary has entrusted anything to the fiduciary, to hold the thing in trust or to execute certain acts in regard to or with reference to the entrusted thing, the fiduciary has to act in confidence and expected not to disclose the thing or information to any third party. There are also certain relationships where both the parties have to act in a fiduciary capacity treating the other as the beneficiary. Examples of these are : a partner vis-a-vis another partner and an employer vis-a-vis employee. <u>An employee who comes into possession of business or trade secrets or confidential information relating to the employer in course of his employment, is expected to act as a</u></p>

## Information- Exempted

---

			<p><u>fiduciary and cannot disclose it to others. Similarly, if on the request of the employer or official superior or the head of a department, an employee furnishes his personal details and information, to be retained in confidence, the employer, the official superior or departmental head is expected to hold such personal information in confidence as a fiduciary, to be made use of or disclosed only if the employee's conduct or acts are found to be prejudicial to the employer.</u></p>
15	Whether PF details of an employee can be furnished to the Spouse of such employee?	<b>No</b>	<p>Siddharth Bhargava v. EPFO: CIC/BS/A/2012/001377/2985</p> <p>Dated 12.07.2014</p> <p><a href="http://rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_BS_A_2012_001377_2985_M_114738.pdf">http://rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_BS_A_2012_001377_2985_M_114738.pdf</a></p> <p>Information which relates to personal information, 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 would fall within the exempted category, unless the authority concerned is satisfied that larger public interest justifies the disclosure of such information. It is, therefore, to be understood clearly that it is a statutory exemption which must operate as a rule and only in exceptional cases would disclosure be permitted, that too, for reasons to be recorded demonstrating satisfaction to the test of larger public interest. It will not be in consonance with the spirit of these provisions, if in a mechanical manner, directions are passed by the appropriate authority to disclose information which may be protected in terms of the above provisions.</p>



## Information- Exempted

---

16	Whether copy of legal opinion given by outside legal consultant to be provided?	<b>No</b>	<p>Shri Amarjit Singh Vs. State Bank of India CIC/SM/A/2009/001904AT</p> <p>Dated 18.11. 2010</p> <p><a href="http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CI_C_SM_A_2009_001904_M_45849.pdf">http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CI_C_SM_A_2009_001904_M_45849.pdf</a></p> <p>Shri Dilipbhai C Dave Vs. SBI, Rajkot CIC/MP/A/2014/001746</p> <p>Dated 30.12. 2014</p> <p><a href="http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CI_C_MP_A_2014_001746_M_146759.pdf">http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CI_C_MP_A_2014_001746_M_146759.pdf</a></p> <p>CIC held that "Appellant is right in claiming that the exemption of Section 8(1) (e) was available only to the advice received by a client from an Advocate or the Counsel and not the opinion of one of its officers even if such an opinion is a legal advice. There is a material difference between the former and the latter."</p>
<b><u>D</u></b>	<b><u>Exempted Under Section 8(1)(g)</u></b>		
17	Whether details of future Tour Programs of any official to be disclosed?	<b>No</b>	
18	Whether names and identity of Interview Committee Members to be disclosed?	<b>No</b>	<p>Kerala Public Service Commission and Ors. Vs. The State Information Commission and Ors., SLP (C) Nos. 15919-15950 of 2011 &amp; SLP (Civil) No. 5433 of 2014</p> <p>Dated: 04.02.2016, Supreme Court</p> <p><a href="http://judis.nic.in/supremecourt/imgs1.aspx?filename=43346">http://judis.nic.in/supremecourt/imgs1.aspx?filename=43346</a></p> <p>Bihar State Public Service Commission v. Syed Hussain Abbas Rizvi :</p>

## Information- Exempted

---

			<p>Civil Appeal No 9052 of 2012.</p> <p>Dated 13.12.2012, Supreme Court.</p> <p><a href="http://gic.gujarat.gov.in/UserFiles/file/C_A_9052%20of%202012.pdf">http://gic.gujarat.gov.in/UserFiles/file/C_A_9052%20of%202012.pdf</a></p>
<b>E</b>	<b><u>Exempted Under Section 8(1)(j)</u></b>		
19	<p>Whether information regarding details of the medical facilities availed by the Public servant to be disclosed?</p>	<b>No</b>	<p>Subhash Chandra Agarwal vs. The Registrar, Supreme Court of India &amp; ors (LPA 34/2015 &amp; C.M.No.1287/2015).</p> <p>Dated 17.04.2015, Delhi High Court.</p> <p><a href="http://delhicourts.nic.in/April2015/Subhash%20Chand%20Agarwal%20Vs.%20The%20Registrar.pdf">http://delhicourts.nic.in/April2015/Subhash%20Chand%20Agarwal%20Vs.%20The%20Registrar.pdf</a></p> <p>Details of the medical facilities availed is personal information, and providing such information would undoubtedly amount to invasion of the privacy, however, total expenditure incurred for the medical treatment may be provided by the CPIO.</p>
20	<p>Whether copies of memo, Show Cause Notice and orders of punishment and details of movable and immovable properties, investments, income tax returns, lending and borrowing from Banks and other financial institutions of an individual to be disclosed ?</p>	<b>No</b>	<p>Girish Ramchandrs Deshpande v. Central Information Commission.</p> <p>(SLP (civil) No. 27734 of 2012).</p> <p>Dated 03.10.2012, Supreme Court</p> <p><a href="http://judis.nic.in/supremecourt/imgs1.aspx?filename=39615">http://judis.nic.in/supremecourt/imgs1.aspx?filename=39615</a></p> <p>Copies of all memos issued to an individual, show cause notices and orders of censure/punishment etc. are qualified to be personal information as defined in clause (j) of Section 8(1) of the RTI Act.</p>

## Information- Exempted

---

			<p>The details disclosed by a person in his income tax returns are "personal information" which stand exempted from disclosure under clause (j) of Section 8(1) of the RTI Act, unless involves a larger public interest and the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer or the Appellate Authority is satisfied</p>
21	<p>Whether proviso of Section 8(1)(j) is applicable to entire subsection (1) of Section 8 ?</p>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p>Vijay Prakash Vs UOI and Ors. W.P. (C) 803/2009 Dated 01.07.2009, Delhi High Court. <a href="http://delhicourts.nic.in/Jul09/VIJAY%20PR&lt;br/&gt;AKASH%20VS.%20UOI.pdf">http://delhicourts.nic.in/Jul09/VIJAY%20PR AKASH%20VS.%20UOI.pdf</a></p> <p>The proviso is only applicable to Section 8(1)(j) and it is confined to the class of information that Parliament can ordinarily seek. If it is held that all information relating to all public servants, even private information, can be accessed by Parliament, Section 8(1)(j) would be devoid of any substance, because the provision makes no distinction between public and private information. Moreover there is no law which enables Parliament to demand all such information; it has to be necessarily in the context of some matter, or investigation.</p>
22	<p>Whether a Public Authority can seek exemption on the ground of personal information of its own?</p>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p>Jamia Milia Islamia Vs Shri Ikramuddin; W.P. (C) No. 5677/2011, Delhi High Court. Dated 22.11.2011. <a href="http://delhicourts.nic.in/nov11/JAMIA%20&lt;br/&gt;MILLIA%20ISLAMIA%20VS.%20SH%20IK&lt;br/&gt;RAMUDDIN.pdf">http://delhicourts.nic.in/nov11/JAMIA%20 MILLIA%20ISLAMIA%20VS.%20SH%20IK RAMUDDIN.pdf</a></p>

## Information- Exempted

---

			Personal information available with Public Authority relating to others and not of the Public Authority is exempted.
23	Whether Annual Performance Appraisal (APA) asked by a third person to be disclosed?	<b>No</b>	<p>Tapas Datta v. IOCL: 11/107/2006-CIC</p> <p>Dated 28.03.2006.</p> <p><a href="http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_Order_Dtd_28032006_3.pdf">http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_Order_Dtd_28032006_3.pdf</a></p> <p>The assessment reports by the superior officers are personal and confidential information and therefore exempted under Section 8(1) (j) of the RTI Act.</p>
24	Whether copy of Investigation Report to be disclosed to a third party?	<b>No</b>	<p>HK Chaturvedi v. Deputy Commissioner of Police, CIC/WB/A/2008/00170</p> <p>Dated 08.07.2009.</p> <p><a href="http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/WB-08072009-04.pdf">http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/WB-08072009-04.pdf</a></p> <p>If the information seeker is neither a complainant nor the witness or accused in the matter, the disclosure of investigation report about third party would cause invasion of privacy and hence exempted under Sec 8(1)(j).</p>
25	Whether certified copies of the documents comprising experience certificate, PAN Card, VAT certificate, etc submitted by a party in the tender to be provided to a third party ?	<b>No</b>	<p>Bibhu Prasad Panda v. BSNL: CIC/BS/A/2012/001032/2998, Dated 16.07.2013.</p> <p><a href="http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_BS_A_2012_001032_2998_M_114657.pdf">http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_BS_A_2012_001032_2998_M_114657.pdf</a></p> <p>It is an admitted fact that the eligibility documents submitted by the various bidders are open for inspection to the other</p>

## Information- Exempted

---

			participating bidders; hence, there may not be any harm in allowing similar inspection to the appellant. However, certified copies of the documents need not be provided as the third parties have declined to give their consent.
26	Whether copy of the salary slip of an employee can be provided to a third party?	<b>No</b>	Shri Chetan Kothari Vs. New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Mumbai  CIC/MP/A/2014/001086  Dated 03.03.2015  <a href="http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CI_C_MP_A_2014_001086_M_149497.pdf">http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CI_C_MP_A_2014_001086_M_149497.pdf</a>
27	Whether details of the attendance of an employee to be disclosed?	<b>No</b>	Shri Chetan Kothari Vs. New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Mumbai  CIC/MP/A/2014/001086  Dated 03.03.2015  <a href="http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CI_C_MP_A_2014_001086_M_149497.pdf">http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CI_C_MP_A_2014_001086_M_149497.pdf</a>
28	Whether residential address and residential Number of an Official to be disclosed?	<b>No</b>	Shri Chira Ranjan Biswas Vs. FCI CIC/YA/A/2014/000087 F. CIC/YA/A/2014/000655 F CIC/YA/A/2014/002166  Dated 31.03.2015  <a href="http://rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_YA_A_2014_002166_M_151418.pdf">http://rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_YA_A_2014_002166_M_151418.pdf</a>  Residential addresses of the officers is personal information u/s 8(1)(j), disclosure of which has no larger public interest.

## Information- Exempted

---

<b>E</b>	<b><u>Exemptions/denial under Miscellaneous Provisions</u></b>		
29	Whether opinion can be sought under the RTI Act?	<b>No</b>	<p>Central Board of Secondary Education and Anr. v. Aditya Bandopadhyay and Ors.</p> <p>CIVIL APPEAL NO.6454 OF 2011 SLP [C] No.7526/2009</p> <p>Dated 09.08.2011, Supreme Court.</p> <p><a href="http://jmi.ac.in/upload/menuupload/rti_SC_CBSE.pdf">http://jmi.ac.in/upload/menuupload/rti_SC_CBSE.pdf</a></p> <p>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.</p> <p>A public authority is also not required to furnish information which require drawing of inferences and/or making of assumptions. It is also not required to provide `advice' or `opinion' to an applicant, nor required to obtain and furnish any `opinion' or `advice' to an applicant. The reference to `opinion' or `advice' in the definition of `information' in section 2(f) of the Act, only refers to such material available in the records of the public authority. Many public authorities have, as a public relation exercise, provide advice, guidance and opinion to the citizens. But that is purely voluntary and should not be confused with any obligation under the RTI Act.</p>

## Information- Exempted

---

30	Whether Clarification, reason or questions can be sought under the RTI Act?	<b>No</b>	<p>Khanapuram Gandaiah Vs. Administrative Officer and Ors.</p> <p>SLP (Civil) No. 34868 of 2009 Decided On: 04.01.2010, Supreme Court.</p> <p><a href="http://judis.nic.in/supremecourt/imgs1.aspx?filename=35896">http://judis.nic.in/supremecourt/imgs1.aspx?filename=35896</a></p> <p>Under the RTI Act "information" is defined under Section 2(f). This definition shows that an applicant under Section 6 of the RTI Act can get any information which is already in existence and accessible to the public authority under law. Of course, under the RTI Act an applicant is entitled to get copy of the opinions, advices, circulars, orders, etc., but he cannot ask for any information as to why such opinions, advices, circulars, orders, etc. have been passed, especially in matters pertaining to judicial decisions. No litigant can be allowed to seek information as to why and for what reasons the judge had come to a particular decision or conclusion. A judge is not bound to explain later on for what reasons he had come to such a conclusion.</p>
31	Whether PIO is obliged to collect and compile the information in order to furnish the same to applicant?	<b>No</b>	<p>Central Board of Secondary Education and Anr. v. Aditya Bandopadhyay and Ors.</p> <p>CIVIL APPEAL NO.6454 OF 2011 SLP [C] No.7526/2009</p> <p>Dated 09.08.2011, Supreme Court.</p> <p><a href="http://jmi.ac.in/upload/menuupload/rti_SC_CBSE.pdf">http://jmi.ac.in/upload/menuupload/rti_SC_CBSE.pdf</a></p> <p>The Act does not cast an obligation upon the public authority, to collect or collate non available information and then furnish it to an applicant.</p>

## Information- Exempted

---

32	Whether PIO is obliged to collect the information from other PIO and furnish the same to applicant or Whether PIO is obliged to transfer the RTI application to other PIO if the information sought is pertaining to them?	<b>No.</b>	<p>a) If the information sought by the applicant is not available with the PIO and same is available/ supposed to be available with the other PIO(s) then such application should not to be transferred to the other PIO(s)and applicant should be informed that the information sought is available with other PIO(s) and he/she may file separate applications before those PIO(S).</p> <p>b) If the applicant is asking about the information which pertains to the entire organization and part of the information is available within the jurisdiction of PIO to whom application has been addressed and part information is available/supposed to be available with other PIO(s), then concerned PIO should furnish the information <u>which is available within his/her jurisdiction and should not transfer the application to other PIO(s)</u> and also information is not to be collected from other PIO(s). However, it should be informed to the applicant that part of the information sought may be available with other PIO(s) of the IOCL and he/she may file separate application before such PIO's.</p> <p>c) In case of (a)&amp;(b), if the applicant has given his/her email id then such application should be transferred to the Concerned PIO(s) through email under intimation to the applicant advising him/her to submit the requisite fee to concerned PIO(s).</p>
----	--	------------	---



## Information- Exempted

---

33	Whether PIO is obliged to transfer the RTI application to other Public Authorities if the information sought is pertaining to them?	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>No.</b></p> <p>[(i)If the information sought pertains to another Public Authority, it should be transferred and PIO should give information relating to his/her jurisdiction if, applicable.</p> <p>(ii) If the information sought pertains to more than one Public Authority, applicant should be advised to submit applications to concerned Authority)].</p>	<p>Sh. Mukesh Kumar Choudhury Vs Central Public Information Officer, Central Sheep &amp; Wool Research Institute,</p> <p>File No. CIC/SH/C/2014/000307,</p> <p>Date 14.07.2015.</p> <p><a href="http://rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_SH_C_2014_000307_M_159090.pdf">http://rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_SH_C_2014_000307_M_159090.pdf</a></p>
34	Whether copy of answer sheet of a candidate to be given to a third party?	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>No</b></p>	<p>Ms.Harpreet Kaur Vs. Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board, Delhi</p> <p>File No.CIC/SA/A/2014/000135</p> <p>Dated 21.01.2015</p> <p><a href="http://rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_SA">http://rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_SA</a></p>

## Information- Exempted

---

			<p><a href="#">A_2014_000135_M_146583.pdf</a></p> <p>A candidate with regard to his/her own answer sheet can obtain the copy of the same as a matter of right, but with regard to the answer sheet of third party, unless the candidate is able to show that large public interest is involved, the same cannot be furnished unless the candidate from whom it is sought for permits the same.</p>
35	Whether information sought by Non – Citizens to be provided?	<p><b>No</b></p> <p>(Information sought by a foreigner can be denied by virtue of Section 3 of the RTI Act.)</p>	<p>M/s. Alka Automobiles &amp; Electronics Suppliers Vs N F Railway, Guwahati.</p> <p>CIC/AD/C/2010/000092</p> <p>Dated 10.02.2010</p> <p><a href="http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/A_D-10022010-05.pdf">http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/A_D-10022010-05.pdf</a></p>
36	Whether reply of RTI sought in a particular language to be provided?	<p><b>No</b></p> <p>If PIO is not conversant in that language. Applicant can be advised to get it translated.</p>	<p>Ashok Kumar Goyal v. CPIO, Supreme Court of India</p> <p>CIC/SM/A/2012/001282 &amp; 1621</p> <p>Dated 22.02.2013.</p> <p><a href="http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_SM_A_2012_001621_M_104073.pdf">http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_SM_A_2012_001621_M_104073.pdf</a></p>
37	Whether copy of a document sought in a particular language to be provided?	<p><b>No</b></p> <p>If the information is not available in that particular language.</p>	<p>Ashok Kumar Goyal v. CPIO, Supreme Court of India:</p> <p>CIC/SM/A/2012/001282 &amp; 1621</p> <p>Dated 22.02.2013.</p> <p><a href="http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_SM_A_2012_001621_M_104073.pdf">http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_SM_A_2012_001621_M_104073.pdf</a></p>

## Information- Exempted

---

38	Whether multiple applications on the same point to be entertained?	<b>No</b> Reply can be denied to subsequent applications.	Shri Brij Mohan Mahajan v. IOCL: CIC/LS/A/2013/000258  Dated 14.02.2013.  <a href="http://rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_LS_A_2013_000258_M_104527.pdf">http://rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_LS_A_2013_000258_M_104527.pdf</a>
39	Whether explanation regarding the marks awarded for RO dealership to be provided?	<b>No</b> Explanation does not fall within the ambit of information under section 2.	Anurag Singh v. IOCL, UP: CIC/SH/A/2014/000125  Dated 02.01.2015.  <a href="http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_SH_A_2014_000125_SH_M_145573.pdf">http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_SH_A_2014_000125_SH_M_145573.pdf</a>  The Appellant has access to the information regarding the marks awarded during the selection process for the dealership in question. However, in his RTI application he sought an explanation regarding the marks allotted to a third party applicant and to him. CIC held that the marks allotted were as per the relevant rules of IOCL, information regarding the relevant rules is available in their brochures, which in turn is available to all the applicants.
40	Whether vague and unspecific information to be disclosed?	<b>No</b>	Nitesh Kumar Tripathi v. Ministry of Youth Affairs & Sports: CIC/LS/A/2012/000938  Dated 14.3.2013.  <a href="http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_LS_A_2012_001032_M_107247.pdf">http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_LS_A_2012_001032_M_107247.pdf</a>  CIC observed that demand for vague and omnibus information does not serve any purpose. Besides, collection, collation and transmission of information take time and

## Information- Exempted

---

			impinge on resources of the public authority.
41	Whether RTI application submitted without requisite fee by a non- BPL Applicant to be entertained?	<b>No</b>	<p>Mani Ram Sharmav. Addl. Director &amp; Joint Secretary, Lok Sabha Secretariat: CIC/SM/A/2013/000875/RM</p> <p>Dated: 09.07.2014.</p> <p><a href="http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_SM_A_2013_000875_RM_M_135167.pdf">http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_SM_A_2013_000875_RM_M_135167.pdf</a></p> <p>Such application is not required to be replied as it cannot be treated as RTI application.</p>
42	Whether redressal of personal grevances can be sought through RTI Act ?	<b>No</b> There is no provision in the RTI Act for redressal of grievances.	<p>Shri G N Rao Vs The CPIO, The Fertilizer Corporation of India Ltd</p> <p>CIC/KY/A/2014/000282</p> <p>Dated 13.11.2014</p> <p><a href="http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_KY_A_2014_000282_M_142601.pdf">http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_KY_A_2014_000282_M_142601.pdf</a></p>
43	Whether an identity of the witness can be disclosed?	<b>No</b>	<p>Devendra Sigh v. Vigilance, Police Bhawan: CIC/SS/C/2010/000054</p> <p>Date: 23.06.2010.</p> <p><a href="http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_SS_C_2010_000054_M_37013.pdf">http://www.rti.india.gov.in/cic_decisions/CIC_SS_C_2010_000054_M_37013.pdf</a></p> <p>In case of apprehension of threat to the life and security of a witness in an investigation, while giving a copy of the report, the CPIO may withhold the names of the witnesses from the same.</p>