

Central Information Commission  
File No.CIC/SM/A/2009/001010 dated 25-08-2008  
Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (19)

Dated: 4 March 2010

Name of the Appellant : Shri Dhansukhlal J Bodiwala  
9/190, Shree Ganesh Niwas,  
Pagathia Sheri Wadifalia,  
Surat - 395 003.

Name of the Public Authority : CPIO, State Bank of India,  
Local Head Office,  
9<sup>th</sup> Floor, Lal Darwaja,  
Ahmedabad.

The Appellant was represented by Shri Bhaskar Bodiwala.

On behalf of the Respondent, Shri Mahesh Goel, CPIO present.

2. In this case, the Appellant had, in his application dated 25 August 2008, requested the CPIO for the statement of account in respect of Account Number 01050/060699 of M/s Neelesh Textiles Mills for the last 20 years. In his reply dated 4 October 2008, the CPIO denied the information claiming exemption from disclosure under Section 8(1) (e) and (j) of the Right to Information (RTI) Act and also by stating that he had not enclosed the application fee in the prescribed manner. Against this, the Appellant preferred an appeal on 10 October 2008. The Appellate Authority disallowed the appeal in his order dated 21 October 2008 by endorsing the decision of the CPIO. Now, the Appellant has come before the CIC in second appeal against the above order.

3. We heard this case through videoconferencing. The son of the Appellant and the Respondent were both present in the Surat studio of the

NIC. We heard their submissions. On behalf of the Appellant, it was argued that the information should be disclosed to the Appellant since he was a member of the same family which owned M/s Neelesh Textiles Mills and, therefore, he had a right to know about the account of this company. On the other hand, the Respondent argued that the Appellant was not an authorised person and the said account was being operated by someone else and, therefore, the details about that account could not be disclosed to the Appellant who was obviously a third party. We have consistently held that the account details of customers of a Bank cannot be disclosed to third parties unless it would serve a larger public interest as provided in Section (8) (1) (d) of the Right to Information (RTI) Act. In this case, there is no larger public interest involved at all. Therefore, the CPIO was not wrong in denying the information.

4. The case is, thus, disposed off.
5. 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**