

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

Club Building (Near Post Office)

Old JNU Campus, New Delhi - 110067

Tel: +91-11-26161796

Decision No. CIC/SG/A/2011/002729/16387

Appeal No. CIC/SG/A/2011/002729

Relevant Facts emerging from the Appeal

Appellant : Smt. Jayalakshmi
C/o All Banks Daily Deposit Collectors Assn.,
R.No. 9, 2nd Floor,
Corporation Bldg,
Broadway, Hubli 580 020

Respondent : Mr. Srikant
Public Information Officer & Dy. General Manager,
Corporation Bank,
Head office, M.T. Road,
Mangladi Temple, Mangalore- 575001

RTI application filed on : 11/07/2011
PIO replied : 21/07/2011
First appeal filed on : 25/07/2011
First Appellate Authority order : 25/08/2011
Second Appeal received on : 28/09/2011

Sl.	Information Sought	Reply of the PIO
1.	Amount of fees/expenses paid by the bank to its advocate pertaining to Misc. A No. 15/05, 17/05, 24/05, 37/05, 46/05, 1/07 held/pending before the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bangalore along with the date of payment, name and address of the advocate and name of the advocate who appeared before the Tribunal in each case, in each sitting; number of sittings held in each case; date of orders passed by the Tribunal in the cases; date of communication of orders of the Tribunal by the advocate to you in each case; date of implementation of the orders by your bank.	The information sought would disproportionately divert the resources of the public authority or would be detrimental to the safety or preservation of the record in question and hence the same is denied under s. 7(9) of the RTI Act, 2005.
2.	Copy of notice served by Central Vigilance Commission to the Chairman & Managing Director Mr. Ramnath Pradeep, Mr. B.R. Bhat, General Manager during 2011; dates on which Central Vigilance Commission officials visited Head Office of the Bank in 2011 and the name, designation, address of the said officials.	The information sought is personal information, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest and would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the individuals and is exempted under s. 8(1)(j). Thus, the information was declined.
3.	Number of domestic enquiries held by Mr. S.V.S. Dattatreya, officer of the bank pertaining to sub staff, clerks/special assistants/officers/ JD Collectors till date in each category separately; number of sub staff, clerks/special assistants/officers/JDCollectors dismissed/discharged/compulsorily retired in the domestic enquiry conducted by Mr. Dattatreya, Officer in each category separately.	The information sought would disproportionately divert the resources of the public authority or would be detrimental to the safety or preservation of the record in question and hence the same is denied under s. 7(9) of the RTI Act, 2005.

Grounds for the First Appeal:

Incomplete and unsatisfactory information provided by the PIO.

Order of the First Appellate Authority (FAA):

The FAA also rejected the information sought on the grounds of s. 8(1)(j) & 7(9) of the RTI Act, 2005 and that the information sought was voluminous in nature.

Grounds for the Second Appeal:

No information was provided by the PIO and reply of the PIO was unsatisfactory. The information sought was rejected.

Relevant Facts emerging during Hearing:

The following were present

Appellant: Mr. M. Ramarao representing Smt. Jayalakshmi on video conference from Dharwad Studio;

Respondent: Mr. Srikant, Public Information Officer & Dy. General Manager on video conference from NIC-Mangalore Studio;

The respect to query-1 the respondent has stated that the information is available in various branch offices and hence it would divert the resources of the public authority disproportionately to compile it. The Appellant states that he would be satisfied if the information sought by him was provided at the Legal Cell of the Bangalore Office. The Commission directs the PIO to provide the information available at the Legal Cell of the Bangalore Office with respect to query-1.

With respect to query-3 the Appellant states that he would be satisfied if the PIO give him information with respect to inquiries conducted by Mr. S. V.S. Dattatreya which are available in his personal file. The PIO is directed to provide details of inquiries for which records are available in Mr. Dattatreya's personal file.

With respect to query-2 the PIO is directed to give the information available on the records.

Decision:

The Appeal is allowed.

The PIO is directed to provide the information as directed above to the Appellant before 05 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
16 December 2011

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