

**Central Information Commission, New Delhi**  
**File No.CIC/SM/A/2012/001938**  
**Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (19)**

**Date of hearing** : **7 May 2013**

**Date of decision** : **7 May 2013**

**Name of the Appellant** : **Shri Natraj Saha,**  
**Shiv Talla Pada Bai Number – 11,**  
**(AGGAR), In Front of Jhikta Bhawan,**  
**Birbhum, W.B – 731 224.**

**Name of the Public Authority** : **CPIO, Central Vigilance Commission,**  
**Satarkta Bhawan, GPO Complex,**  
**Block A, INA, New Delhi – 110 023.**

The Appellant was not present in spite of notice.

On behalf of the Respondent, the following were present:-

- (i) Shri Subrata Das, SO,
- (ii) Shri Amrendra Kumar, Assistant

**Chief Information Commissioner** : **Shri Satyananda Mishra**

2. We heard the submissions of the Respondent.

3. The Appellant had sought a variety of information ranging from the complete details of all the complaints received in the CVC during the entire year from 1 January to 31 December 2006 to the complaint handling policy of the CVC, the details of its members etc. Except for the details of the complaints received during the year 2006, the CPIO had provided the remaining information. In regard to the details of the complaints, he had observed that the desired information was not being maintained in the form in which it had been

sought and the collection of the details of the complaints for this period would disproportionately divert the resources of the CVC. Not satisfied with this reply, the Appellant had preferred an appeal. The Appellate Authority had disposed of the appeal by endorsing the response of the CPIO.

4. During the hearing, the respondent submitted that the CVC ordinarily received several thousand complaints a year. According to him, there was no common database in which the details of all the complaints including the action taken on each one of those was recorded. Therefore, in order to find out the details desired by the Appellant, someone will have to search through innumerable files and records. We tend to agree with this position. While seeking any information, it is the duty of the information seeker to specify the information. Seeking omnibus information, such as, the details of all the complaints received during the whole year and the action taken on those has the clear potential of derailing the normal working of the CVC because there is no central database from which this information could be extracted. While it is true that section 9 of section 7 of the Right to Information (RTI) Act is not about to denial of information, in the present case, the CPIO cannot be faulted for pointing out that the desired information was not available and could not be collected without proportionately diverting their resources. Needless to say, he has provided the remaining information.

5. We find no reason to interfere with the order of the Appellate Authority in the case. The case is disposed off accordingly.

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

**(Satyananda Mishra)**  
**Chief 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**