

Central Information Commission, New Delhi
File No.CIC/SM/A/2011/001883, 2129 & 2188
Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (19)

Date of hearing : **31 July 2012**

Date of decision : **31 July 2012**

Name of the Appellant : **Ms. Manju,**
25/20, Tilak Nagar,
New Delhi – 110 018.

Name of the Public Authority : **CPIO, Central Bureau of Investigation,**
Anti Corruption Branch, Plot No. 5-B,
1st Floor, A & B Wing, CGO Complex,
New Delhi – 110 003.

CPIO, Central Bureau of Investigation,
Policy Division, North Block,
New Delhi.

The Appellant was present along with Shri Vinay.

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

- (i) Shri Ravi Gambhir, ASP,
- (ii) Shri M.R. Kadole, AIG (P)

Chief Information Commissioner : **Shri Satyananda Mishra**

We heard these three cases together. Both the parties were present and made their submissions.

2. In one of these cases, namely, case number CIC/SM/A/2011/00 2129, the RTI application had been filed on 13 June 2011, that is, after the inclusion of the CBI in the second schedule to the Right to Information (RTI) Act on 9 June 2011. Therefore, the CBI is not obliged to provide the desired information to the Appellant as the provisions of the Right to Information (RTI) Act would

not apply to the CBI after the above notification except in case of information relating to corruption or human rights violations.

3. As far as the two remaining cases are concerned, in the case number CIC/SM/A/2011/001883, there were three queries out of which the CPIO had provided the desired information against the last two. The first query is found to be extremely vague and according to the Respondent, the desired information is not maintained in the format in which it had been sought. The Appellant has sought the list of all the employees of three specific banks in Delhi who might have been produced as witnesses in trap cases during the period 2004 to 2010. As the Respondent clarified the CBI never maintained information on the basis of the attributes of the witnesses but on the basis of the number of the case. In order to find out about the employment records of each witness, he submitted, every single case file would have to be scrutinised, a task almost impossible looking to the long period for which the information had been sought. We agree with the Respondent. Therefore, in this case, there is no further information to be disclosed.

4. This leaves us with the third case, that is, case number CIC/SM/A/2011/002188. In this case, whatever information the Appellant has sought can be found out, if at all, from the Manual the CBI has prescribed for investigation and prosecution of cases. The Respondent submitted that the CBI Manual was already available in the CBI website from which it could be accessed by anyone. Even if that is so, it would be helpful if the CPIO would inform the Appellant about the exact address of the website from where the Manual could be accessed. We direct the CPIO to write to the Appellant within

five working days of receiving this order informing her about the address of the CBI website and pointing out the link for accessing the CBI Manual on this subject.

5. The three appeals are disposed off accordingly.
6. Copies of this order be given free of cost to the parties.

Sd/-
(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