

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

Room No. 302, CIC Bhawan,
Baba Gang Nath Marg,
Munirka, New Delhi-110067

Decision No. CIC/SH/C/2016/000310, Dated 19.01.2018

**A. Gopi Krishna vs. CPIO, Syndicate Bank, Regional Office,
Visakhapatnam**

Relevant dates emerging from the Complaint:

RTI: 19.07.2016	FA: No FA	Complaint: 28.07.2016
CPIO: No reply	FAAO: No Order	Hearing: 18.01.2018

ORDER

1. The complainant filed an application under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) before the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO), Syndicate Bank, Main Branch, Visakhapatnam seeking certified copies of certificates/documents which were submitted by Smt. Alla Satyavati and Smt. Alla Satyarao, to the Bank for mortgage of land.

2. The complainant filed a complaint before the Commission on the grounds that the CPIO did not respond to his RTI application. The complainant stated that the documents are readily available in the bank and requested the Commission to prevail over the bank to provide him the information sought for.

Hearing:

3. The complainant was not present despite notice. The respondent Shri Vijay Babu, Regional Manager, Syndicate Bank, Regional Office, Visakhapatnam, attended the hearing through video conferencing.

4. The respondent submitted that the CPIO did not receive the complainant's RTI application and therefore, information could not be provided to him within the stipulated time period. However, on receipt of the Commission's notice for hearing in the matter, the complainant was requested to furnish a copy of his RTI application to the CPIO once again so that an appropriate reply can be furnished to him.

Decision:

5. The Commission, after hearing the submissions of the respondent and perusing the records, observes that as per the complainant's submissions, his brother had handed over a copy of the RTI application to the Bank in person which was not accepted by the bank, therefore, he sent his RTI application by post to the respondent. The Commission finds the complainant's assertion plausible because the copy of the RTI application enclosed with the appeal has a stamp 'Received by hand' which perhaps was crossed later on by the bank. The Commission notes that record keeping, receipt and dispatch and proper maintenance of files is a key function of any public authority. In view of this, it is imperative to ascertain (i) the facts leading to the non-receipt of the RTI application submitted by hand by appellant's brother, (ii) whether the RTI application sent by post was received by the Bank. The Commission, therefore, directs the FAA, Syndicate Bank, Regional Office, Visakhapatnam, to inquire into the matter as to whether the RTI application was received in the branch and, if so, what action was taken on the RTI application. The FAA shall also, if required, take appropriate departmental action against the officers responsible for the misplacement of the RTI application. A copy of the inquiry report along with the action taken report may be provided to the Commission as well as to the appellant within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

6. With the above observations, the complaint is disposed of.

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

(Sudhir Bhargava)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(S.S. Rohilla)
Designated Officer

Addresses of the parties:

1. The Central Public Information Officer (CPIO),
Syndicate Bank,
Regional Office, Main Branch,
30-15-141, 2nd Floor,
Pawan Commercial Complex,
Main Road, Dabagardens,
Visakhapatnam-530020.
2. Mr. A. Gopi Krishna,