

**Central Information Commission, New Delhi**  
**File No. CIC/SH/A/2015/001360**  
**Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (19)**

**Date of hearing** : 16th August 2016

**Date of decision** : 16th August 2016

**Name of the Appellant** : **Shri Tolendra Kumar Baghmar, Advocate  
Chandrakar Chambers, Civil Court,  
Raipur, Chhattisgarh**

**Name of the Public Authority/Respondent** : **Central Public Information Officer,  
Dena Bank,  
Regional Office, 2nd Floor, L.I.C.  
Investment Building-II, Behind L.I.C.  
Divisional Office, Pandri,  
Jeevan Bima Marg, Raipur, C.G. -492004**

**RTI Application filed on** : 01/04/2015

**CPIO replied on** : 21/04/2015

**First Appeal filed on** : 25/04/2015

**First Appellate Authority order on** : 28/04/2015

**2<sup>nd</sup> Appeal received on** : 11/05/2015

The Appellant was represented by Shri Anuj Mishra, who was present at the NIC Studio, Raipur.

On behalf of the Respondents, Shri Ashok Goel, Deputy Zonal Manager was present at the NIC Studio, Raipur.

**Information Commissioner : Shri Sharat Sabharwal**

**Information sought**

This matter concerns an RTI application filed by the Appellant, seeking information on two points regarding the account of Gram Panchayat of Mandir Hasauda.

**The CPIO reply**

The CPIO denied the information under section 11 of the RTI Act.

**Grounds of the First Appeal**

Not satisfied with the CPIO's reply.

**Order of the First Appellate Authority**

The FAA upheld the CPIO's reply.

**Grounds of the Second Appeal**

Not satisfied with the response of the Respondents.

**Relevant facts emerging during the Hearing, Discussion and Decision**

The representative of the Appellant stated that elections to the above panchayat took place in January 2015 and a new sarpanch was elected on 26.1.2015. However, the

outgoing sarpanch, in connivance with some officials of the bank, withdrew as much as Rs. 29 lakhs from the panchayat account, even though he did not have the authority to do so. The Appellant needs the information in the above context and its disclosure is a matter of larger public interest.

2. The Respondents reiterated their decision to deny the information as it pertained to the account of a third party, i.e. the panchayat.

3. We have considered the submissions of both the parties and note that the Respondents holds the information concerning the accounts of their customers in a fiduciary capacity and it is exempted from disclosure under Section 8 (1) (e) of the RTI Act, in the absence of a finding of larger public interest. The Appellant has not established any larger public interest for disclosure of the information sought by him. His unsubstantiated allegation regarding an unauthorised withdrawal from the account by the outgoing sarpanch cannot become the ground of larger public interest.

4. In view of the foregoing, we uphold the decision of the Respondents to deny the information in this case.

5. With the above observations, the appeal is disposed of.

6. Copies of this order be given free of cost to the parties.

Sd/-  
**(Sharat Sabharwal)**  
**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)**  
**Deputy Registrar**