

Central Information Commission
File No.CIC/SM/A/2009/000164, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 232 & 233
Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (19)

Dated: 4 March 2010

Name of the Appellant : Shri Mansukh Anandji Sethia
Partner & Constituted Attorney of M/s
Veena Sales Corporation,
Station Road, Valsad,
Gujarat - 396 001.

Shri Nitin Anandji Sethia
201, Riddish Apartment,
Opp. Dream Land Cinema,
Tithal Road, Valsad - 396 001.

Name of the Public Authority : CPIO, Bank of Baroda,
Regional Office, Bulsar Region,
Mahalaxmi Towers, Tithal Road,
Bulsar - 396 001.

The Appellant's were present in person.

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

- (i) Shri Subash Bhargav,
- (ii) Shri Paranjapi, FAA,
- (iii) Shri Venugopal, Chief Manager (Legal)

2. During the hearing, the Appellants were present in the Valsad Studio of the NIC whereas the Respondents were present in the Ahmedabad Studio. The Appellants submitted that even after the direction of the Commission, the information provided to them was both inadequate and incomplete. On the other hand, the Respondents stoutly claimed that all the available information had already been provided to the Appellants in all these cases.

3. We carefully perused the information sought and what has been provided. We also kept in mind the fact that the Appellants had inspected the relevant records on the direction of this Commission. However, the Appellants are still not satisfied with the information provided by the CPIO and find it to be incomplete. Since the Respondents claimed that no further information other than what has been already provided is materially available with them, we cannot obviously compel them to produce such

information from nowhere. All that they must do to dispel any apprehension from the mind of the Appellant is to give them a sworn affidavit explaining in detail that except for the variety of information already provided against all their queries, the Public Authority does not hold anything more on these subjects.

4. In the light of the above, we direct the CPIO to forward to the Appellants, combinedly, for all these cases, within 10 working days from the receipt of this order, a detailed sworn affidavit containing therein the list of all the 21 items of information sought in these cases and against each of those, a statement to the effect that the Bank does not have any further information to be provided other than what has already been disclosed from time to time. Particularly, the affidavit must state that the various interest rates charged on the cash-credit facilities extended in the case of all the units of the Veena Group came into effect only from the year 1993 onwards and not prior to that and that the statements of accounts provided by the CPIO included, the interest, penal interest and any other interest charged from time to time and that no separate document or information exists showing such interest rates except these statements.

5. We direct the CPIO to forward a copy of the above affidavit to this Commission also for our information.

6. With the above directions, all the appeal cases stands 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