

**CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Club Building (Near Post Office)**  
**Old JNU Campus, New Delhi - 110067**  
**Tel: +91-11-26161796**

**Decision No. CIC/SG/A/2011/003029/16801**  
**Appeal No. CIC/SG/A/2011/003029**

**Relevant Facts emerging from the Appeal**

Appellant : Mr. Dharmendra Kumar Aggarwal  
R/o: 211, Dariba pan, Inside Fatak,  
Executive Member (Press Club Moradabad),  
Moradabad (.U.P),

Respondent : Dr. Sanjeev Sharma  
Public Information Officer & General Manager-in-Charge  
**Reserve Bank of India,**  
Department of Currency Management,  
Central Office: Amar Building, PM Road,  
Mumbai - 400001.

RTI application filed on : 08/06/2011  
PIO replied : 06/07/2011  
First appeal filed on : 18/08/2011  
First Appellate Authority order : 29/09/2011  
Second Appeal received on : 24/10/2011

Sl.	Information Sought	Reply of the PIO
1.	When the authority/official of RBI received aforesaid complaints letter of mine. Please provide Diary No. date and name of official who received.	Reply is enclosed by the PIO.
2.	(i) The complaint is very serious pertains to forge note currency counterfeited notes. What action has been initiated on the matter. Please provide copies of day to day report verified copies of the file movement register (where it was sent and to whom, what action the concerned official took, what is his/their reply and if the matter has been forwarded and to whom and (ii) What is the present status of complaint. Please provide copies of entire action with file noting along with file notes.	(i) You are requested to visit the office to peruse the same.  (ii) The reply was sent to you on May 6, 2011 (copy enclosed). For file notings with file notes. You are requested to visit the office to peruse the same.
3.	What is the latest report, provide the information in this regard.	As stated 2(i) above.
4.	Provide information that so far now many complaints in this regards in this matter have been received by Reserve Bank of India since 2006. Also provide the copies of complaint letters.	Four copies enclosed.
5.	What action by the RBI officials in this matter has been taken so far because	The matter was taken up with the PNB through protracted correspondence. A

	meeting with the PNB official was also held. The matter being sub-judice, it was deemed to that any action at our end may not be appropriate. RBI has also responded to letters received from Sh. Pradip Tamta, MP and All India Employee Unity Forum, Kolkata.
--	---

**Grounds for the First Appeal:**

Incomplete and unsatisfactory information provided by the PIO.

**Order of the First Appellate Authority (FAA):**

“In this case, we also observe that the Complainant, it had addressed his application for information to the CPIO in the RBI whereas he was seeking information about various nationalized Banks. Rightly, he should have sought such information from those Public Authorities directly and not from the RBI. Similarly, the CPIO of the RBI should have returned his application with the advice to approach appropriate CPIO, in the respective Public Authorities rather than transferring his application to the head offices of the Banks concerned, in the process, leading to avoidable delays. The CPIO has not destroyed any information. There is no question of CPIO furnishing proof of matter being sub judice. The appellants, if he so desired could approach PNB for further details.

**Grounds for the Second Appeal:**

Unsatisfactory reply

**Relevant Facts emerging during Hearing:**

The following were present

**Appellant:** Mr. Bimal Kumar Khemani representing Mr. Dharmendra Kumar Aggarwal on telephone through mobile no. 09412224625;

**Respondent:** Ms. Mini K. Krishnan, Assistant Legal Advisor on behalf of Dr. Sanjeev Sharma, Public Information Officer & General Manager-in-Charge on video conference from NIC-Mumbai Studio;

The PIO has given most of the information but is now directed to give the following information:

- 1- The entire file of the complaints of the Appellant and action taken by the officers and replies received from any bank in the matter. The Commission would like to note that when the matter concerns just one or two files the PIO should offer photocopies of those files instead of asking the appellants to come and inspect. In the instant case the PIO should have realized that the appellant has to come from Muradabad and is being asked to incur too much expense.

**Decision:**

The Appeal is allowed.

The PIO is directed to send attested copy of the entire file as directed above to the Appellant before 30 January 2012.

This decision is announced in open chamber.

Notice of this decision be given free of cost to the parties.

Any information in compliance with this Order will be provided free of cost as per Section 7(6) of RTI Act.

**Shailesh Gandhi**  
**Information Commissioner**  
**12 January 2012**

*(In any correspondence on this decision, mention the complete decision number.)(PRE)*