

Central Information Commission
File No.CIC/SM/A/2009/000560 dated 23-07-2008
Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (19)

Dated: 3 March 2010

Name of the Appellant : Smt. Sapna Pai Fondekar
Hira Kunj,
Near Power House,
Aquem Margoa, Goa.

Name of the Public Authority : CPIO, State Bank of India,
Local Head Office,
Synergy Plot No. C-6, G Block,
Bandra Kurla Complex, P.B. No. 8123,
Bandra (E), Mumbai.

The Appellant was present in person.

On behalf of the Respondent, the following were present:-

- (i) Shri Krishnamurthy, AGM,
- (ii) Smt. Iyer

2. In this case, the Appellant had, in her application dated 23 July 2008, requested the CPIO for a large number of information about the service and administrative details about various officers of the organisation. In his reply dated 26 August 2008, the CPIO declined to furnish any information by citing the provisions of Sections 7 (9) and 8(1) (j) of the Right to Information (RTI) Act. Against this, the Appellant preferred an appeal on 22 September 2008 which the Appellate Authority dismissed in his order dated for November 2008 by agreeing with the CPIO. The Appellant has challenged this order in her second appeal.

3. We heard this case through videoconferencing. The Appellant was present in the Porvorim studio of the NIC while the Respondent was present in the Mumbai studio. We heard their submissions. The Respondent submitted that the Appellant had sought information on a variety of issues including about a very large number of officers with effect from 1970 and collection of such information would disproportionately divert the resources

of the Bank, more so since most of this information was not being maintained in the form in which it had been sought. We carefully examined the request for information. The very first information she has sought is about the posting details of nearly 90 officers of the Bank since 1970. The next information she wants is about all those officers of the Bank who have been continuously posted for more than 10, 12, 15, 18, 20, 22 and 25 years in the same municipal area/metropolitan city/module ever since 1970. The rest of the information sought by her, more or less, is in similar lines. On the face of it, we are inclined to agree with the submission of the Respondent that if the Bank did not maintain such information about its officers centrally, it would involve extensive research on their part to construct such information about the transfer and posting of such a large number of officers from innumerable files. The Respondent also categorically submitted that it was not the practice of the Bank to maintain such information in this manner and it would be impossible to generate such information with any degree of accuracy for so many officers and for such a long period of time.

4. The Appellant submitted that she would be satisfied if the Bank would provide her with the information available with them for whatever period and not necessarily since 1970. In view of this revised request, we direct the CPIO to provide to the Appellant within 10 working days from receipt of this order, all the information sought by her for the Maharashtra and Goa Circle if such information is being maintained in the format sought by her and, in case, it is not available, to say so in a sworn affidavit. However, since the information sought in items 11 and 13 of her application does not fall in the above category, we direct the CPIO to provide the relevant information against these two items within the same period of 10 working days.

5. We notice that the CPIO had rejected the application for information by citing some provisions of the Right to Information (RTI) Act without caring to explain how those provisions were attracted. Passing this kind of telegraphic orders is totally unacceptable. We would like to get an

explanation from the CPIO in this regard. We, therefore, direct him to explain in writing the decision for his rejecting the application in this manner within 15 working days from the pursuit of this order.

6. With the above direction, the appeal is disposed off.
7. Copies of this order be given free of cost to the parties.

(Satyananda Mishra)
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)
Assistant Registrar