

# Telangana State Information Commission

(Under Right to Information Act, 2005)

D.No.5-4-399, Samachara Hakku Bhavan (Old ACB Building),

Mojam-jahi-Market, Hyderabad – 500001.

Phone: 24740155 Fax: 247405928

**Complaint No: 3315/SIC-SK/2019**

**Date: 03-09-2021**

Complainant : Sri G. Venkata Ramana,  
Nalgonda District.

Respondent : Public Information Officer  
(U/RTI Act, 2005)  
O/o the Registrar Judicial,  
High Court for the State of Telangana,  
Hyderabad.

## **Order**

Sri G. Venkata Ramana, Nalgonda District has filed a Complaint dated: 16-03-2019 which was received by this Commission on 18-03-2019 for not getting the information sought by him from the PIO / O/o the Registrar Judicial, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.

The brief facts of the case as per the Complaint and other records received along with it are that the Complainant herein filed an application dated: 06-03-2019 before the PIO requesting to furnish the information under Sec. 6(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, on the following points mentioned in his application annexed.

విషయం :-OA.No.5416 OF 2013 సంబంధించి తుది తీర్పు ఇవ్వకుండా గడిచిన ఐదు సంవత్సరాల ఏడు నెలల నుండి వాయిదాలు వేయడానికి సంబంధించిన సమాచారాన్ని దృవీకరించి ఇవ్వడం గురించి..

వివరణ :-నేను అనగా గాదె.వెంకట్ రమణ, తండ్రి విద్యాసాగర్ రెడ్డి,నల్గొండ.నేను గవర్నమెంట్ జూనియర్ కాలేజీ,పద్దేముల్,ఉమ్మడి రంగారెడ్డి జిల్లా (వికారాబాద్ జిల్లా) లో కాంట్రాక్ట్ ఫ్యాకల్టీగా కెమిస్ట్రీ సబ్జెక్టులో కాంట్రాక్ట్ జూనియర్ లెక్చరర్ గా పనిచేస్తున్నాను.2012 మార్చి లో జరిగిన ఇంటర్మీడియట్ పబ్లిక్ ఎక్సామ్ లో నేను భోదించిన ఇంటర్ సెకండ్ ఇయర్ సబ్జెక్టు లో ఉత్తీర్ణత తక్కువగా వచ్చిందని, కమిషనర్ ఆఫ్ ఇంటర్మీడియట్ ఎడ్యుకేషన్ హైదరాబాద్ గారి నియమాలకు విరుద్ధంగా కాలేజీ ప్రెసిసిపల్ నా యొక్క కాంట్రాక్ట్ ఫ్యాకల్టీ అగ్రిమెంట్ ను 2012-2013 విద్యా సంవత్సరానికి రెన్యూవల్ చేయలేదు.ప్రెసిసిపల్ నిర్ణయం వలన

And more few points.

The PIO vide Lr. No. Roc.No.105/PIO/JUDL/2019 dated. 11-03-2019 furnished the information to the Complainant.

Stating that the PIO has not furnished the required information even after 30 days of filing his application, he preferred this Complaint before the Commission requesting to arrange to furnish the information sought by him u/s 18(1) of the RTI Act, 2005.

In view of the above, the Complaint was taken on file and Notices are issued to both the parties for hearing on 03-09-2021 at 10.30 A.M.

The case is called on 03-09-2021. The complainant is absent. Sri M. Sudharshan, Advocate on record for O/o the Registrar Judicial, High Court of Telangana, Hyderabad is present and filed his affidavit stating that vide letter R.O.C No: 105/PIO/JUDL/2019 dated: 11-03-2019 the appellant was informed that as per section 6(1) of the RTI Act a fee of Rs. 10/- is to be paid by the way of adhesive Court fee stamp / demand draft / pay order or postal order for each application drawn in favour of the SPIO and since the appellant failed to pay the fee the application was pre-requisite for consideration.

Perused the material papers available on record and observed that the complainant through 6(1) application dated: 06-03-2019 is seeking the reasons as to why the interim order in OA No: 5416 of 2013 is still pending for final decision. The Commission relied upon the decision of the Central Information Commission in appeal No: CIC/AT/A/2006/00586 dated: 18-09-2007 reads as follows:

*“49. It is our conclusion, therefore, that given a judicial authority must function with total independence and freedom, should it be found that an action initiated under the RTI Act impinges upon the authority of that judicial body, the Commission will not authorize the use of RTI Act for any such disclosure requirement. Section 8(1)(b) of the RTI Act is quite clear, which gives a total discretion to the court or the tribunal to decide as to what should be published. An information seeker should, therefore, approach the concerned court or the tribunal if he intends to have some information concerning a judicial proceeding and it is for the concerned court or the tribunal to take decision in the matter as to whether the information requested concerning judicial proceedings either pending before it or decided by it can be given or not.”*

Therefore in view of the above, the complaint is closed.

**SYED KHALEELULLAH  
STATE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER**

**Authenticated by:**

**Section Officer  
Copy to: SO / SF / OC**