

**Central Information Commission, New Delhi**  
**File No.CIC/SM/A/2012/001112, 1592 & 1638**  
**Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (19)**

**Date of hearing** : **15 February 2013**

**Date of decision** : **15 February 2013**

**Name of the Appellant** : **Shri Ajay Kumar Sharma,**  
**House No. 118, Indira Enclave**  
**(Ghisarpatti), Harbansbala Pocket – 3,**  
**Post Office Mehubala,**  
**Dehradun – 240 171.**

**Name of the Public Authority** : **CPIO, O/o. the Principal Accountant**  
**General (Audit), Uttrakhand,**  
**Vaibhav Palace, C-1/105, Indira Nagar,**  
**Dehradun – 248 006.**

The Appellant was present.

On behalf of the Respondent, Shri Rajdeep Singh, CPIO was present.

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

2. Both the parties were present in the Dehradun studio of the NIC. We heard their submissions.

3. In three separate RTI applications, the Appellant had sought a large variety of information, some on hypothetical subjects and some factual in nature. The CPIO had provided some information while also inviting him in some cases to inspect the records to find out the exact information. The Appellate Authority had, more or less, endorsed the response of the CPIO in all these cases.

4. We have carefully gone through the contents of the RTI applications. The Appellant has, indeed, sought far too many information, some of it in prescribed formats. As reported by the Respondent, the Appellant has filed more than 25 such RTI applications in the recent months. The Right to Information (RTI) Act gives the citizen the right to seek information held by public authorities. This does not mean that a citizen should monopolise the entire public authority with a barrage of requests thereby rendering it almost dysfunctional for any other purpose. In the background of the fact that the Appellant, in this case, is a dismissed employee of the organisation, his relentless demand for information smacks of vengeful conduct. All of us should remember that the time spent in a government office in collecting and disclosing information is done at the cost of some other equally useful work.

5. In the light of the above, we would like the CPIO to revisit the contents of all the three RTI applications and the information he has already provided against these. Leaving aside all hypothetical questions, he must provide all factual information, namely, copies of various records and documents, against the remaining queries. We direct him to provide the remaining such information within 15 working days of receiving this order clearly indicating the RTI application/query against which any such information is being given. In case, some of the information sought is very voluminous or is dispersed in several files, he should invite the Appellant to the office and place before him the relevant files and records for his inspection after which he can provide the copies of the identified records and documents. All such information should be provided free of charge.

6. All the three appeals are disposed of accordingly.

7. 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**