

केन्द्रीय सूचना आयोग
Central Information Commission
बाबा गंगनाथ मार्ग, मुनिरका
Baba Gangnath Marg, Munirka
नई दिल्ली, New Delhi – 110067

द्वितीय अपील संख्या / Second Appeal No.(s) :- CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167486-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167480-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167481-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167482-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167483-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167485-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167479-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167477-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167476-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167473-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167474-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167475-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167471-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167470-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167468-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167467-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167466-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167462-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167460-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167459-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167458-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167457-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167453-BJ+
CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167463-BJ

Mr. Kantilal B. Chavda

....अपीलकर्ता/Appellant

VERSUS

बनाम

CPIO
Central University of Gujarat
Sector – 29, Gandhinagar
Gujarat – 382030

...प्रतिवादीगण /Respondent

Date of Hearing : 15.01.2019
Date of Decision : 15.01.2019

ORDER

Date of RTI applications	03.03.2017 (As mentioned in 2 nd)
--------------------------	---

	appeal.)
CPIO's response	24.03.2017
Date of the First Appeal	24.05.2017
First Appellate Authority's response	Not on Record
Date of diarised receipt of Appeals by the Commission	25.09.2017

RTI – 1 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167486-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 03 points inter alia regarding the year wise list of vendors/ dealers/ companies as approved under rate contract, the list of vendors/ dealers/ companies along with their address from whom chemicals were purchased and vendor-wise total purchase value of chemicals under the rate contract for Schools of Chemical Sciences, Life Sciences and Environmental Sciences since 2010.

RTI – 2 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167480-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 03 points regarding the names of the Chairperson and the Members of the Library Committee from 2009 onwards, the total amount of books purchased by the University Library since 2009, details of supplier/ vendor wise payment made towards books purchased since 2009.

RTI – 3 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167481-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 04 points inter alia regarding the centre/ school wise list of books published with national publishers with well-established peer review system from AY 2009 to 2016, centre wise list of articles in peer-reviewed international journal along with copies of front page of the article for the aforementioned period, etc.

RTI – 4 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167482-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 03 points regarding the process of recruitment for the post of Registrar at CUG, copy of the resume/ application of the incumbent Registrar and a copy of the resolution of the Executive Council for appointing the incumbent Registrar.

RTI – 5 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167483-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 04 points regarding the position of Registrar at the Central University of Gujarat, whether such position was advertised by the University along with the copy of the advertisement, if any; whether there was any scrutiny

committee to go through the applications/ resumes received for such post along with the number of such applications received.

RTI – 6 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167485-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 02 points regarding copies of the agenda and the minutes of all the meetings of the Executive Council of Central University of Gujarat held since 2009.

RTI – 7 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167479-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information pertaining to the 1st Meeting of the Executive Council of the Central University of Gujarat and desired the dates of EC Meetings held, dates of circulation of agendas for EC meetings, date of circulation of the minutes of the meeting together with the date of confirmation of the minutes.

RTI- 8 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167477-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 03 points regarding the academic years for which the CUG conducted online entrance test for admission, amount paid to the agency that provided online test centres for each academic year and whether tendering was done to select the agency for providing test centre services along with the copy of tendering documents, if any.

RTI – 9 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167476-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information regarding the teachers working at the Central University of Gujarat and desired their name, Date of issue of appointment order by CUG, their date of joining CUG, date of confirmation of service at CUG and issues related thereto.

RTI – 10 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167473-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 5 points regarding academic years in which Central University of Gujarat (CUG) participated in CUCET for admission into its

different programme, different academics year in which CUG (since its establishment) conducted its own entrance test and issues related thereto.

RTI – 11 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167474-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 05 points regarding the criteria for merit list for admission of M.Phil., Ph.D. programmes followed by the university for different academic year since 2010-11, candidate-wise written score in CUG entrance test in M.Phil., Ph.D. programme for different academic year since 2010-11 and issues related thereto.

RTI – 12 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167475-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 5 points regarding names of professor working in Central University of Gujarat appointed under invitation, deputation, direct recruitment and CAS promoted along with their dates of joining the university since the establishment of the university, if university constituted any scrutiny committee for each professor then their report etc.

RTI – 13 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167471-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 03 points regarding the books purchased by the university and demanded for the year-wise list of the 20 most expensive books purchased by the university library from 2009 onwards; the number of times these 20 books were issued to the students/ faculty along with the list of vendors who won the tenders since 2009 etc.

RTI – 14 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167470-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 04 points inter alia regarding the calculation details of the API score as claimed by the Associate Professors for Category I and II as per the 2nd Amendment of UGC Regulations, 2013 and whether it was verified by IQAC, copies of the Selection Committee recommendation on each of the Associate Professors who had applied for the CAS promotion to professor at CUG etc.

RTI – 15 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167468-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 03 points regarding the names of the post of Professors (example – Professor of Chemical Science) filled in CUG, the number of applications/resumes received/examined by scrutiny committee or expert committee or university authority in the university; whether the university had advertised for the positions of professors currently filled.

RTI – 16 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167467-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 04 points inter alia regarding the number of applicants who became eligible for the position of Professor based on expert/scrutiny committee report; the number of applicants who attended the interview if the same was held; copies of the applications/ resumes considered by the selection committee for direct recruitment, etc.

RTI – 17 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167466-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 03 points regarding the names of the M.Phil dissertations submitted by the students since 2009 along with the letter grade awarded to each paper by the internal and external examiner since 2009 etc.

RTI – 18 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167462-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 4 points regarding the centre/school wise list of international and national conferences/seminars/workshops held in academic year 2009-2010 to 2015-2016 organised by centre/school, centre/school wise list of lectures by invited external experts and issues related thereto.

RTI – 19 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167460-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 2 points regarding copies of the applications of all associate professor appointed by the university since 2009, copies of selection committee recommendation on each of associate professor appointed by the university since 2009.

RTI – 20 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167459-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 03 points regarding the academic year-wise centre/school-wise names of faculty members who set entrance question paper for MA/M.Sc/M.Lib.I.Sc./M.Phil/Ph.D. since 2009-10 and issues related thereto.

RTI- 21 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167458-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information regarding copies of all scrutiny committee reports on faculty recruitment done with reference to CUG/Notification No. (as mentioned in the RTI application) etc.

RTI – 22 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167457-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 03 points regarding copies of application, IQAC report and API details of all Associate Professors who had applied for CAS promotion to professor at CUG in response to CUG Notification dated 15.01.2016 and other issues related thereto.

RTI – 23 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167453-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 03 points regarding vendors-wise total purchase value of chemicals under Local Purchase Committee for Schools of Chemical Science, Life Sciences and Environmental Sciences, Central University of Gujarat since 2010 and other issues related thereto.

RTI – 24 File No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167463-BJ

FACTS:

The Appellant vide his RTI application sought information on 03 points inter alia the list of external examiners and the number of times each external examiner participated in M.Phil dissertation evaluation since 2009, the titles of Ph.D. thesis as approved by CASR along with the dates of approval since 2009 as also the date of submissions of Ph.D thesis etc.

The CPIO vide its letter dated 24.03.2017 requested the Appellant to visit the University office personally on the grounds of ambiguity and inconvenience caused due to multiple RTI applications filed by him. Dissatisfied due to the non-receipt of any information even after visiting the office, the Appellant approached the FAA. The order of the FAA, if any, is not on the record of the Commission. (During the hearing, however, the Respondent informed the Commission that the First Appeal was replied on 22.08.2017 concurring with the decision of the CPIO).

HEARING:

Facts emerging during the hearing:

The following were present:

Appellant: Absent;

Respondent: Prof. Balaji Ranganathan, CPIO/ Chairperson, Comparative Literature and Translation Studies through VC;

The Appellant remained absent during the hearing. Mr. Darshan Parmar, Network Engineer NIC studio at Ahmedabad confirmed the absence of the Appellant. The Respondent while re-iterating the response of the CPIO submitted that a consolidated response was provided to the Appellant requesting him to personally visit the University for inspection of documents due to the reason that the queries were vague and ambiguous in nature and that multiple RTI queries seeking large and voluminous information were filed. It was further submitted that the Appellant visited their

office for inspection on 17.04.2017 without any prior intimation hence inspection could not be allowed since several documents pertained to archived records which had to be collected. Hence, they had sought time from the Appellant to trace all the records and provide the same in accordance with the provisions of the Act. However, instead of cooperating with them, the Appellant approached the FAA who vide its order dated 22.08.2017 reiterated the aforementioned position and sought further time for collation of records. During the hearing, the Respondent also raised the issue of BPL identity card being enclosed by the Appellant in his RTI application requesting for large and voluminous information running into thousands of pages, free of cost, for which they had sought the guidance from the State Information Commission, Gujarat on 01.04.2017. The State Information Commission, Gujarat however, in turn vide its letter dated 02.05.2017 informed him that the matter did not fall within their jurisdiction. It was also conveyed that at this stage they were willing to offer inspection of documents provided the Appellant indicated specific records to facilitate retrieving of such records. He also stated that several queries pertained to matters which were sub-judice before Courts, the disclosure of which could be made only on a case to case basis.

Having heard the Respondent at length and on perusal of the queries raised in each of the RTI application, the Commission felt that several queries inter alia regarding disclosure of vendor-wise total purchase value of chemicals, Chairperson and the Members of the Library Committee, the total amount of books purchased by the University Library, minutes for the appointment of Registrar, minutes of Executive Council Meetings, years for which the University conducted online entrance test, criteria for merit list for admission of M.Phil., Ph.D. programmes followed by the university etc. should be suo motu disclosed on the website of the Public Authority for the interest of the public at large. The Commission, therefore, observed that a voluntary disclosure of all information that ought to be displayed in the public domain should be the rule and members of public who *having to seek* information should be an exception. An open government, which is the cherished objective of the RTI Act, can be realised only if all public offices comply with proactive disclosure norms. Section 4(2) of the RTI Act mandates every public authority to provide as much information *suo-motu* to the public at regular intervals through various means of communications, including the Internet, so that the public need not resort to the use of RTI Act.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the matter of CBSE and Anr. Vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay and Ors 2011 (8) SCC 497 held as under:

“37. The right to information is a cherished right. Information and right to information are intended to be formidable tools in the hands of responsible citizens to fight corruption and to bring in transparency and accountability. The provisions of RTI Act should be enforced strictly and all efforts should be made to bring to light the necessary information under Clause (b) of Section 4(1) of the Act which relates to securing transparency and accountability in the working of public authorities and in discouraging corruption.”

The Commission also observes the Hon'ble Delhi High Court ruling in WP (C) 12714/2009 Delhi Development Authority v. Central Information Commission and Another (delivered on: 21.05.2010), wherein it was held as under:

“16.It also provides that the information should be easily accessible and to the extent possible should be in electronic format with the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be. The word disseminate has also been defined in the explanation to mean - making the information known or communicating the

information to the public through notice boards, newspapers, public announcements, media broadcasts, the internet, etc. It is, therefore, clear from a plain reading of Section 4 of the RTI Act that the information, which a public authority is obliged to publish under the said section should be made available to the public and specifically through the internet. There is no denying that the petitioner is duty bound by virtue of the provisions of Section 4 of the RTI Act to publish the information indicated in Section 4(1)(b) and 4(1)(c) on its website so that the public have minimum resort to the use of the RTI Act to obtain the information.”

Furthermore, High Court of Delhi in the decision of General Manager Finance Air India Ltd & Anr v. Virender Singh, LPA No. 205/2012, Decided On: 16.07.2012 had held as under:

“8. The RTI Act, as per its preamble was enacted to enable the citizens to secure access to information under the control of public authorities, in order to promote transparency and accountability in the working of every public authority. An informed citizenry and transparency of information have been spelled out as vital to democracy and to contain corruption and to hold Governments and their instrumentalities accountable to the governed. The said legislation is undoubtedly one of the most significant enactments of independent India and a landmark in governance. The spirit of the legislation is further evident from various provisions thereof which require public authorities to:

A. Publish inter alia:

i) the procedure followed in the decision making process;

ii) the norms for the discharge of its functions;

iii) rules, regulations, instructions manuals and records used by its employees in discharging of its functions;

iv) the manner and execution of subsidy programmes including the amounts allocated and the details of beneficiaries of such programmes;

v) the particulars of recipients of concessions, permits or authorizations granted. [see Section [4\(1\)\(b\)](#), (iii), (iv), (v); (xii) & (xiii)].

B. Suo moto provide to the public at regular intervals as much information as possible [see Section [4\(2\)](#)].”

However, it was also observed that in matters such as Second Appeal No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167476, CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167474, CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167475, CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167470, CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167466, CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167460, CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167459, CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167458, CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167457 and CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167463 several queries revolved around seeking confidential / personal information of Third Party including information which could endanger the life and physical safety of any person. The disclosure of these queries was specifically exempted under Section 8 (1) of the RTI Act, 2005.

In this context, the Commission referred to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in *Girish Ramchandra Deshpande vs. Central Information Commission & ors.* SLP(C) No. 27734 of 2012 dated 03/10/2012 wherein it was held as under:

“13.....The performance of an employee/officer in an organization is primarily a matter between the employee and the employer and normally those aspects are governed by the service rules which fall under the expression "personal information", the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest. On the other hand, the disclosure of which would cause unwarranted invasion of privacy of that individual. Of course, in a given case, if the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer of the Appellate Authority is satisfied that the larger public interest justifies the disclosure of such information, appropriate orders could be passed but the petitioner cannot claim those details as a matter of right.”

The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the matter of *Canara Bank Rep. by its Deputy Gen. Manager v. C.S. Shyam*, Civil Appeal No. 22 of 2009 dated 31.08.2017 had held as under:

“5) The information was sought on 15 parameters with regard to various aspects of transfers of clerical staff and staff of the Bank with regard to individual employees. This information was in relation to the personal details of individual employee such as the date of his/her joining, designation, details of promotion earned, date of his/her joining to the Branch where he/she is posted, the authorities who issued the transfer orders etc. etc

11) Having heard the learned counsel for the appellant and on perusal of the record of the case, we are inclined to allow the appeal, set aside the impugned order and dismiss the application submitted by the 1st respondent under Section 6 of the Act.

*12) In our considered opinion, the issue involved herein remains no more res integra and stands settled by two decisions of this Court in *Girish Ramchandra Deshpande vs. Central Information Commissioner & Ors.*, (2013) 1 SCC 212 and *R.K. Jain vs. Union of India & Anr.*, (2013) 14 SCC 794, 5 it may not be necessary to re-examine any legal issue urged in this appeal.*

14) In our considered opinion, the aforementioned principle of law applies to the facts of this case on all force. It is for the reasons that, firstly, the information sought by respondent No.1 of individual employees working in the Bank was personal in nature; secondly, it was exempted from being disclosed under Section 8(j) of the Act and lastly, neither respondent No.1 disclosed any public interest much less larger public interest involved in seeking such information of the individual employee and nor any finding was recorded by the Central Information Commission and the High Court as to the involvement of any larger public interest in supplying such information to respondent No.1.”

With regard to the disclosure of faculty members who set entrance question paper for MA/M.Sc/M.Lib.I.Sc./M.Phil/Ph.D, list of external examiners and the number of times each external examiner participated in M.Phil dissertation evaluation, the Commission observed that the same was exempted from disclosure as per Section 8 (1) (g) of the RTI Act, 2005. In this context, a reference can be made to the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of

Central Board of Secondary Education and Anr. v. Aditya Bandopadhyay and Ors (Civil Appeal No. 6454 of 2011) wherein it was held as under:

“28.....the information as to the names or particulars of the examiners/coordinators/scrutinisers/head examiners are therefore exempted from disclosure under Section 8 (1)(g) of RTI Act, on the ground that if such information is disclosed, it may endanger their physical safety. Therefore, if the examinees are to be given access to evaluated answer-books either by permitting inspection or by granting certified copies, such access will have to be given only to that part of the answer-book which does not contain any information or signature of the examiners/coordinators/scrutinisers/head examiners, exempted from disclosure under Section 8 (1)(g) of RTI Act.”

Furthermore, the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order dated 7/10/2013 in W.P. (C) 4079/2013 Union Public Service Commission vs. G S Sandhu wherein while observing that denial of notings altogether was not justified directed to block the name, designation or any other indication which disclose or tend to disclose the identity of author, it was held as under:

“11. In my view, the apprehension of the petitioner that if the identity of the author of the file notings is revealed by his name, designation or in any other manner, there is a possibility of such an employee being targeted, harassed and even intimidated by the persons against whom an adverse noting is recorded by him on the file of UPSC, is fully justified. Though, ultimately it is for the members of the UPSC who are to accept or reject such notings, this can hardly be disputed that the notings do play a vital role in the advice which UPSC ultimately renders to the concerned department. Therefore, the person against whom an adverse advice is given may hold the employee of UPSC recording a note adverse to him on the file, responsible for an adverse advice given by UPSC against him and may, therefore, harass and sometime even harm such an employee/officer of UPSC, directly or indirectly. To this extent, the officers of UPSC need to be protected.

Furthermore, the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the decision of KVS v. CIC and Anr. W.P.(C) 6892/2009 dated 15.09.2009 while upholding the decision of the Commission had held as under:

“The only objection raised by the petitioner against the supply of statement of witnesses was under Section 8(1)(g) of the Right to Information Act, 2005. The said provision stipulates that information disclosure of which would endanger life and physical safety of any person or identity, the source of information or assistance given in confidence for law enforcement and security purposes need not be supplied. The Information Commissioner keeping in mind Section 8(1)(g) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 has directed that the name of the witnesses need not be disclosed to the respondent No.2.

A reference was also be made to a recent decision of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the matter of Mukesh Kumar vs. Chief Information Commissioner, CIC, W.P. (C) 10691/ 2016 dated 19.09.2017 wherein it was held as under:

“15. Insofar as handwritten marks awarded by interview panel is concerned, those obviously from a part of the working papers of the interview panel and cannot be disclosed; disclosure of such handwritten record would also inevitably disclose the

identity of the members of the interview panel, which as stated above cannot be disclosed to the petitioner.”

The Commission also observed that in Appeal No. CIC/CUGUJ/A/2017/167471, the Appellant did not desire any specific information but sought vague and ambiguous details regarding 20 most expensive books published by the University. In this context a reference can be made to the referred to the following observations made by the High Court of Bombay (Nagpur Bench) in the matter of State Information Commission vs. Tushar Dhananjay Mandlekar, LPA No. 276/ 2012 in Writ Petition No. 3818/2010 (D) dated 30.07.2012 which is relevant to the present matter:

“It is apparent from a reading of what is stated above that instead of seeking information on some specific issues, the respondent sought general information on scores of matters. The application is vague and the application does not make it clear to the Information Officer as to what information is actually sought by the respondent from the Officer. It was literally impossible for the appellants, as pointed by the learned Assistant Government Pleader, to supply the entire information sought by the respondent to the respondent within a period of 30 days. The documents ran into 3419 pages. We had asked the respondent while hearing of this letters patent appeal as to what action did the respondent take in pursuance of the information sought by the respondent after the information was supplied and it was replied by the respondent appearing in person that nothing was done on the basis of the information supplied by the appellants as there was some delay in supplying the information. It is really surprising that thousands of documents are being sought by the respondent from the authorities and none of the documents is admittedly brought into use. We are clearly of the view in the aforesaid backdrop that the application was filed with a mala fide intention and with a view to abuse the process of law.

In the aforesaid set of facts, we feel that there is no justification for imposing the costs of Rs.2,000/- on the appellant no.2. The principle of lex non cogit ad impossibilia is clearly applicable to the facts of the case. Law does not compel a person to do that what is impossible. In the facts of the present case, we feel that it was impossible for the appellant no.2 to supply the information which ran into thousands of pages to the respondent within a period of 30 days, as those pages were not readily available with the respondent on the day the application was filed and the Officers were required to search and collect the information, which was required to be supplied to the applicant.”

Furthermore, the High Court of Delhi in the matter of Shyam Kunwar vs. CIC and Ors., W.P. (C) 5099/ 2016 dated 30.05.2016 had held as under:

“Upon perusal of the RTI application filed by the petitioner in which information of attendance of all teachers have been asked for between the years 1993 and 2001, this Court is of the opinion that the information asked for is stale and no element of public interest is involved. It seems to this Court that the petitioner’s queries are at best a fishing and roving enquiry to challenge ‘Mr.Arun Arya’s meteoric rise from UDC to youngest ever Principal’”

The Appellant was not present to contest the submissions of the Respondent or to establish the larger public interest in disclosure which outweighs the harm to the protected interests.

DECISION:

The Commission noted that the fundamental principles enshrined in the preamble to the RTI Act requiring the Public Authority to facilitate and build an informed citizenry and bring about transparency of information which was vital to its functioning as also to contain corruption and instill a sense of responsibility and accountability in its functioning was not addressed adequately in the aforesaid matters. Keeping in view the facts of the case and the submissions made by the Respondent, the Commission advises the Vice Chancellor / Registrar of the Respondent Public Authority to suo motu disclose the information as narrated in the preceding paragraphs in the public domain in accordance with the provisions of Section 4 of the RTI Act, 2005 for ease and convenience of the stakeholders at large so that the public need not resort to the RTI mechanism for seeking such information as outlined in the aforesaid Court judgements.

The Appeals stand disposed accordingly.

Bimal Julka (बिमल जुल्का)
Information Commissioner (सूचना आयुक्त)

Authenticated true copy
(अभिप्रमाणित सत्यापित प्रति)

K.L. Das (के.एल.दास)
Dy. Registrar (उप-पंजीयक)
011-26182598/ kl.das@nic.in
दिनांक / Date: 15.01.2019

Copy to:-

- 1- Secretary, D/o Higher Education, M/o HRD, 127-C, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi – 110001.
1. Vice Chancellor, Central University of Gujarat, Sector – 29, Gandhinagar, Gujarat – 382030.
2. Registrar, CUG, Central University of Gujarat, Sector – 29, Gandhinagar, Gujarat – 382030.