

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

द्वितीय अपील संख्या / Second Appeal No. CIC/DENAB/A/2017/167556

Shri Ashok Rameshbai Mistry

... अपीलकर्ता/Appellant

VERSUS  
बनाम

CPIO, Dena Bank,  
Surat, Gujarat.

...प्रतिवादीगण /Respondents

Relevant dates emerging from the appeal:

RTI : 20.03.2017	FA : 04.05.2017	SA : 18.09.2017
CPIO : 12.04.2017	FAO : 03.06.2017	Hearing: 01.03.2019

**ORDER**  
**(11.03.2019)**

1. The issues under consideration arising out of **second appeal dated 18.09.2017** include non-receipt of the following information raised by the appellant through his RTI application dated 20.03.2017 and first appeal dated 04.05.2017:

- (i) Provide informative list of the Name of NPA Borrower's loan Account No. along with Capital interest & total remain dues by Bank.
- (ii) Provide informative list of the Name of NPA Borrowers along with Case No. failed at Debt Recovery Tribunal (DRT) at Ahmedabad and any other court of law to recover remain dues from them by Bank.
- (iii) I would like to peruse and to take legally certified extract of any portion of above relevant rules & regulation according to my request under RTI Act 2005 and, so you are requested to mutually decide the date, time & venue for such purposes.

2. Succinctly facts of the case are that the appellant filed an RTI application dated 20.03.2017, under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) before the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO), Dena Bank, Sahara Darwaja, Surat, seeking aforesaid information. The CPIO replied to the appellant on 12.04.2017. Aggrieved by this, the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority (FAA) on 04.05.2017. The FAA disposed of first appeal vide order dated 3.06.2017. Aggrieved by this, the appellant has filed second appeal dated 18.09.2017, before this Commission which is under consideration.

3. The appellant has filed the instant appeal dated 18.09.2017 *inter alia* on the grounds that the CPIO has not furnished information on point no. 8 of the RTI application. Moreover, point-wise information are not supplied.

4. The CPIO replied on 12.04.2017 that information could not be divulged under section 8 (1) (e) of the RTI Act and provided desired information not exempted under such clause. The FAA upheld the response of the CPIO's decision.

5. The appellant remained absent and respondent Mr. Rahul Priyadarshi, Chief Manager (Legal), Dena Bank, Surat, attended the hearing through video conferencing.

5.1. The respondent submitted that the information sought by the appellant does not concern him and the appellant did not describe the purpose of seeking such information. The cumulative information relating to NPA accounts was provided to the appellant vide letter dated 12.04.2017.

6. The Commission after adverting to the facts and circumstances of the case, hearing the respondent and perusal of the records, feels that the respondent has provided part of the desired information to the appellant. The Commission agrees that the remaining information including the names and account number of the NPA burrowers may not be furnished as the same are held in fiduciary capacity. The same are exempted under sub-section (1) (e) of section 8 of the RTI Act. In view of the absence of the appellant to controvert the contentions of the respondent, the response given by the respondent may be accepted. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

Copy of the decision be provided free of cost to the parties.

Sd/-

**Suresh Chandra(सुरेशचंद्रा)**

**Information Commissioner(सूचनाआयुक्त)**

दिनांक/ Date:11.03.2019