

Central Information Commission
Room No.307, II Floor, B Wing, August Kranti Bhawan, Bhikaji Cama Place,
New Delhi-110066
website-cic.gov.in

Case No. CIC/MP/A/2016/001290

Appellant : **Shri Pradeep B. Sharma, Indore.**

Public Authority : **State Bank of India, Jabalpur/Bhopal.**

Date of Hearing : **19th December, 2016**

Date of Decision : **29th December, 2016.**

Present Appellant : **Present through VC.**

Respondent : **Shri Shashinder Singh, Chief Manager & Ms. S. Tirkey through VC.**

RTI application : 21.11.2015
CPIO's reply : 01.12.2015
First Appeal : 12.01.2016
FAA's order : 18.02.2016
Second Appeal : 07.04.2016

Information Commissioner : **Manjula Prasher**

ORDER

1. The appellant, Shri Pradeep B. Sharma, submitted RTI application before the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO), State Bank of India, Bhopal stating that he was posted to I.E. Adhartal Branch, Jabalpur as Chief Manager from 1.4.2003 to 29.5.2006 and RFIA dated 6.12.2005 was conducted during his incumbency and sought copy of Management letter sent directly by the Branch Inspector to the GM of the concerned Network regarding RFIA dated 6.12.2015; copies of page no. 18, 19 and 20 of Personal Banking Division SDRM relating to the RFIA etc. through two points.

2. The CPIO, SBI, Jabalpur to whom the CPIO, Bhopal transferred the RTI application, vide letter dated 10.12.2015 denied the information under the provisions of Section 8(1) (e) of the RTI Act, 2005. Dissatisfied with the decision of the CPIO, the appellant filed an appeal before the first appellate authority (FAA). The FAA vide order dated 20.02.2016 concurred with the decision of the CPIO.

3. Thereafter the appellant filed the present appeal before the Commission stating that the CPI and FAA had not explained the reasons on the basis of which they reached their conclusion of denying the information.

4 The matter was heard by the Commission. The appellant stated that he sought copies of the Management letter and copies of page no. 18, 19 and 20 of of inspection report conducted during his incumbency. The FAA had not justified denial of information u/s 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act. Page Nos. 55, 56 and 57 also pertained to periodic inspection of the bank. The information sought by him was wrongly denied. The respondents stated that the letter related to the GM of the bank. It contained confidential report of the Branch and copies of the same are not given to the branches or the Branch Managers. The appellant is a retired officer and therefore cannot be given an official document not related to him, personally. Moreover, the information sought also had details of account holders and that too could not be provided to the appellant.

5. Having considered the submissions of both the parties, the Commission holds that the information sought cannot be provided to the appellant under the

provisions of Section 8(1)(e) and (j) of the RTI Act, 2005. Moreover, the appellant had not substantiated any larger public interest for divulging such information. The Commission upholds the decision of the FAA. The appeal is disposed of.

(Manjula Prasher)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy:

Deputy Registrar

Address of the parties:

Shri Pradeep B. Sharma,
F-19, Rajat Jayanti Complex,
Scheme No. 54,
Indore-452010

The Central Public Information Officer,
State Bank of India,
Region-I, Regional Business Office,
Administrative Office,
Vijay Nagar,
Jabalpur-482002.

The GM (NW-2)/FAA,
State Bank of India,
Local Head Office,
Hoshangabad Road,
Bhopal-462011

P