

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: 3992/SIC-SK/2022

Date: - 26-08-2022

Appellant : Sri A. Pandu Ranga Chary,
Medak District.

Respondents : Public Information Officer
(U/RTI Act, 2005)
The Gram Panchayat Secretary,
Rangampeta Village, Kolparam Mandal,
Medak District.

First Appellate Authority
(U/RTI Act, 2005)
O/o the District Panchayat Officer,
Medak District.

Order

Sri A. Pandu Ranga Chary, Medak District has filed 2nd appeal dated: 23-03-2022 which was received by this Commission on 25-03-2022 for not getting the information sought by him from the PIO / Gram Panchayat Secretary, Rangampeta Village, Kolparam Mandal, Medak District and 1st Appellate Authority / O/o the District Panchayat Officer, Medak District.

The brief facts of the case as per the appeal and other records received along with it are that the appellant herein filed an application dated: 29-10-2021 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. గత 10 సం. ల నుండి రంగంపేట గ్రామ పంచాయతీకి కేంద్ర, రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వాల నుండి మంజూరైన నిధులు మరియు వివిధ వనరుల ద్వారా గ్రామ పంచాయతీకి సమకాలీన నిధులకు బంధించిన పూర్తి సమాచార ప్రతులు ఇప్పించగలరు.
2. గత 10 సం. ల నుండి చేపట్టిన వివిధ అభివృద్ధి పనులకు సంబంధించిన పూర్తి సమాచార ప్రతులు ఇప్పించగలరు. అట్టి అభివృద్ధి పనులకు ఖర్చు పెట్టిన వ్యయాలకు సంబంధించిన పూర్తి సమాచార ప్రతులు ఇప్పించగలరు.
3. గత 10 సం. ల నుండి గ్రామ పంచాయతీ చేపట్టిన అభివృద్ధి పనులకు గ్రామ పంచాయతీ తరుపున చేసిన అన్ని తీర్మాన కాపీల జేరాక్సులు ఇప్పించగలరు.
4. రంగంపేట గ్రామ పంచాయతీకి సంబంధించి మొత్తం ఎన్ని బ్యాంకు అకౌంట్లు గలవు, అట్టి బ్యాంకు అకౌంట్లకు సంబంధించి గత పది సంవత్సరాల బ్యాంకు స్టేట్ మెంట్లు ఇప్పించగలరు.

Stating that the appellant did not receive the information from the PIO, the appellant filed 1st appeal dated: 03-12-2021 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 this 2nd appeal 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 appeal was taken on file and Notices issued to both the parties for hearing on 26-08-2022 at 10.30 A.M.

The case is called on 26-08-2022. The appellant is absent. The PIO / Smt. J. Priyanka, Panchayat Secretary, Rangampeta Village, Kolparam Mandal, Medak District is present and filed her affidavit stating that the information consisting of 3380 pages was furnished to the appellant vide letter No: GP/10/2022 dated: 01-02-2022 and filed copy of the covering letter along with the postal receipt before the Commission.

Heard the PIO and perused the material papers available on record and observed that the complainant through his 6(1) application dated: 29-10-2021 is seeking huge & voluminous information.

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.”

The Commission is of the view that the PIO has furnished the available information to the appellant, incase the appellant requires any further information, the Commission advises the appellant to file separate application seeking specific information as per Section 6(1) of the RTI Act 2005 and obtain the required information. The Commission took a serious view against the PIO and warns the PIO not to repeat such lapses in future and strictly adhere to the provisions of the RTI Act 2005.

In view of the above, the appeal is closed.

SYED KHALEELULLAH
STATE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER

Authenticated by:

Section Officer
Copy to: SO / SF / OC