

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: 24740592

Appeal No: 9879, 9881, 9882, 9883 & 9925/SIC-SK/2020

Date: - 08-07-2021

Appellant : Sri V. Shyam, Secunderabad

Respondents : Public Information Officer
(U/RTI Act, 2005)
O/o the Deputy Commissioner,
Circle-7, GHMC, Charminar,
Hyderabad.

First Appellate Authority
(U/RTI Act, 2005)
O/o the Zonal Commissioner,
South Zone, Charminar, Hyderabad.

Order

Sri V. Shyam, Secunderabad has filed 2nd appeals before the Commission for not getting the information sought by him from the PIO / O/o the Deputy Commissioner, Circle-7, GHMC, Charminar, Hyderabad and 1st Appellate Authority / O/o the Zonal Commissioner, South Zone, Charminar, Hyderabad.

The brief facts of the case as per the appeal and other records received along with it are that the appellant herein filed applications 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:

- 1) గౌరవ జి.హెచ్.యం.సి. నల్గొల్ లో ప్రస్తుతం విధులు నిర్వహిస్తున్న ఎ.యం.సి. & సూపరంటెండెంట్ గారి పేరు తెలియజేయగలరు. వారి హయాంలో టాక్స్ ఇన్స్పెక్టర్స్ బల్ కలెక్టర్లు అ.సి.తా. చే తేది: 01-01-2019 నుండి 24-02-2020 వరకు ఎంతమంది అధికారులు చిక్కినారు? వారియొక్క పేర్లు అ.సి.తా. చే రెడ్ ఫక్టండ్ గా పట్టుబడినట్లయితే వారి పేర్లు, ఏ తేదీన పట్టుబడినారు? వారియొక్క పూర్తి వివరములు పి.ఐ.ఓ. గారు తెలియజేయగలరు.
- 2) గౌరవ ఎ.యం.సి.సూపరంటెండెంట్ టాక్స్ ఇన్స్పెక్టర్లు, బల్ కలెక్టర్లు జి.హెచ్.యం.సి. లో జాయినింగ్ తేదీ నుండి తేదీ 24-02-2020 వరకు గౌరవ కమిషనర్ కార్యాలయంలో గానీ, ఎం.వి.యూ.డి., సి.డి.యం.వి., డి.యం.వి. లో గానీ, డి.టి.సి.పి. కార్యాలయాలలో గానీ డిప్యూటీ కమిషనర్ గారు ఆస్తులు గానీ, వస్తువులు గానీ కొనుగోలు చేసినట్లు చూపించినారు? స్థిర చరాస్తులు చూపించినారు. కేవలం వారియొక్క సమాచారం తెలియజేయగలరు. నకలు కోరడం లేదు.
- 3) ప్రస్తుతం కొనసాగుతున్న ఎ.యం.సి. & సూపరంటెండెంట్ హయాంలో తమిళనాడు సహా & నల్గొల్ నుండి ఎంతమంది అధికారులు అ.సి.తా.కు చిక్కినారు? ఎంతమంది అధికారులపైన స్టేట్ విజిలెన్స్ జి.హెచ్.యం.సి. విజిలెన్స్ గౌరవ లోకాయుక్తలో, గౌరవ మానవహక్కుల కమిషన్లో, గౌరవ ఉన్నత న్యాయస్థానాలలో కేసులు కలవు? వారియొక్క పూర్తి వివరములు పి.ఐ.ఓ. గారు తెలియజేయగలరు.

And few more points.

Stating that the appellant did not receive the information from the PIO, the appellant filed 1st appeals before the 1st Appellate Authority requesting him to furnish the information sought by him u/s 19(1) of the RTI Act.

Stating that the appellant did not get the information from the PIO / 1st Appellate Authority even after 30 days of filing his 1st appeal, he preferred these 2nd appeals before this Commission requesting to take action against the PIO and 1st Appellate Authority for not furnishing information sought by him and also to arrange to furnish the information sought by him u/s 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.

In view of the above, the 2nd appeals may be taken on file and Notices issued to both the parties for hearing on 08-07-2021 at 11.00 A.M. Since the appellant filed similar appeal in all the case the appeal clubbed, hence common order.

In view of the Covid -19 Pandemic, the cases are heard over phone on 08-07-2021 with prior intimation to the concerned parties. The appellant did not respond. The PIO / Sri. Mohan Reddy, Assistant Municipal Commissioner, Circle – 07, Santosh Nagar, GHMC, Hyderabad responded and stated that the appellant is seeking huge & voluminous information, hence the same could not be furnished.

Heard the PIO and perused the material paper available on record and observed that the appellant through his 6(1) application dated: 04-03-2020 seeking information on 14 Points which is huge & voluminous.

The Commission is of the view that as per the orders issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Central Board of Secondary Education and Anr. Vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay and Ors in Civil Appeal No. 6454 OF 2011 (arising out of SLP(C) No: 7526/2009) wherein in it is stated that:

“Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of the Public Authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counter productive as it will adversely affect the efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information. The Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens. Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of the Public Authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing the information to the appellants instead of discharging their regular duties. The treat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of Public Authorities prioritizing ‘information furnishing’ at the cost of their normal duties.”

Keeping in view of the above Supreme Court decision, the Commission directs the PIO to allow the appellant for verification of records on a fixed date and time by issuing prior intimation to the appellant to enable him to obtain permissible & specific information (Keeping in view of Section 8, 9, 10 & 11 of the RTI Act 2005) and to report compliance to the Commission.

With the above direction, the appeals are closed.

SYED KHALEELULLAH
STATE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER

Authenticated by:

Section Officer
Copy to: SO / SF / OC