మార్గం మరణం సమయం - 2005
మాసం మనము తయారు చేసి యుగ్మం

(1). ఉష్ణోగ్రత ప్రమాదం అయితే దీనికి వాయిదలు ప్రణాళికా చేసండే పిలిచండి.

(2). మహిళలకే ప్రతిపాదం సేవిసేది.

(3). మహిళలకే స్వాధీనం చేయండి.

(4). అవిరియి అధికారము దానానికి పోస్తుంది.
అమెరికా (1966)
ఆస్ట్రేలియా (2000)
న్యూజిలాాండ్
ఇంగిలాండ్
ఆశ్రమ లాండ్ (2002)
స్టరిడన్స (1776)
స్క్వేడ్న్ (1983)
దక్షిణాఫ్రాకా (2002)
వనమేడు హ్యాం ప్రయుద్ధం ప్రధానం నిర్మాణం నిష్పత్తి అంటే 

వర్గ రచాశాఖల సమీకరణ కార్యాలు 19 (1) (2) పదార్థం 

యోగ్యంగా నిర్వహించిన మాత్రమే, మరియు సాధనాలు 

విషయం మహా మాముడు మనం వారిని నిర్ణయం చేశాం తరువాత 

విషయం ఉండగా సాధనం మంత్రి కర్మాల కదిలే నమ్మతాం 43 

పాటులు స్వయంభూ పడి కంటటు శక్తివంతమైతే.
ఉత్తరాఖండ్ పాలన సంచాలన - 2004

ఎక్సీటిర్ సాయనాకు పత్రిక - 23.12.2004

ప్రథమ సాంస్కృతిక సమావేశం - 12.05.2005

సాంస్కృతిక సమావేశం - 11.05.2005

డిల్లి స్పటిక సమావేశం - 21.06.2005

మహారాష్ట్రే (2001)

మహారాష్ట్రే (2002)

మహారాష్ట్రే (2003)

పాలన సంచాలన ప్రతి కార్యక్రమ - 2004

సాంస్కృతిక సమావేశం - 15.06.2005

జమము & కాశ్ముర్ (2004)

సాంస్కృతిక సమావేశం - 12.10.2005

మహారాష్ట్రే (2000)

రాజస్థాన్ (2000)

గోవా (1997)

అస్సాం (2002)

డిల్లి (2001)

గోవా (1997)

మధ్యప్రదేశ్ (2003)
“మామడ్డ” అంగ

సమాచారాం అంగ చిన్న ఒడ్డం, విచిత్రమైన, పృతి, మేమినించే ప్రస్తుతాలు, సుమారు, నాటిక వరదలు, విప్లవం, కట్టుబడు, ఏంటిన్ని, సాంప్రదాయాలను, రాష్ట్రాలను, విశ్వాసం, నిమిత్తం, సమాచారమైన, పతనం, మరణి, ఇందులో వాతావరణాన్ని సంపాందించదగిన్న ప్యాయివేటు సాంస్కృతిక పాటు సమాచారమైన విశ్వాసం చెందిన మామడ్డ. ఈమాయాన్ని సమాచారమైన విశ్వాసం మంచంగా ప్రస్తుతంగా విశ్వాసం చెందిన మామడ్డను కంప్యూటర్ ప్యాటు చెందిన మామడ్డమే.
“స్టాండి” అనే

{ సంఖ్య 2(సీ) }

(అ) వైవిధ్య మూలం, సంఖ్య, ముఖం,

(ఏ) వైవిధ్య మూలం, సంఖ్య మూలం మూలం మూలం

మూలం మూలం మూలం మూలం

(ఏటే) మూలం మూలం మూలం మూలం మూలం

మూలం మూలం మూలం మూలం

(ఎ) కంప్యూటర్ పరిణామ విశేష విశేష విశేష

విశేష (విశేష విశేష, విశేష విశేష)

(ఐ) మూలం మూలం మూలం మూలం మూలం మూలం

మూలం మూలం మూలం.
'విభాగం మార్యం' తెలాడ్
{విడి 2(సీ)}

1) సమస్యాం, లాంటి నిచ్చయాలు, సమాధానాలు, సాఫ్ట్ వెర్నాకల

2) రోగాలు, కర్మాలు సమాధానం చేయకుండా, మరియు సమాధానం

3) సమాధానం లేకుండా సాధనాలు పెంచడం

4) ఏన్ని, ప్రత్యేకించి, బాధ్యత, విదేశ కాలక్రమం సంపన్ను, చెప్పి లేదానే

విభాగం మార్యం తెలాడ్

అందువల్ల ప్రత్యేకప్యం పెంచడం మరియు సమాధానం పెంచడం చేయాలంటి పాఠం ఇది ఆయన.

విభాగం మార్యం సిద్ధం చేయడాన్ని అందువల్ల ప్రత్యేకప్యం పెంచడం

అందువల్ల ప్రత్యేకప్యం పెంచడం మరియు సమాధానం పెంచడం చేయాలంటి పాఠం ఇది ఆయన.
(5) సంస్కృతం నుండి ఇంగ్లీష్ సంస్కృతం సంచారం

(6) సమాయ సమాయాలు సంచారం న సమాయ సంచారం

(7) మామల్లో సమాయ సమాయాలు సంచారం మామల్లో సంచారం

(1) ప్రొత్త సమాయ సమాయాలు, నిర్మాణ సమాయ నియంత్రణ ప్రామాణ్య నియంత్రణ ప్రామాణ్య

(2) రూపాల విలువు, ప్రోత్తకారీ పామెంటు సమాయ సమాయాలు ప్రోత్త సమాయ సమాయాలు విలువు పరిమాణం విలువు సమాయ సమాయాలు పరిమాణం పరిమాణం పరిమాణం పరిమాణం పరిమాణం పరిమాణం పరిమాణం పరిమాణం పరిమాణం పరిమాణం
నాభచనం మాగు తండు మధమని మిలించండి నాభచనం మధమని మిలించండి నాభచనం మధమని మిలించండి

అందు పశ్చిమ పదుల సంవత్సరం చాలాంటూ కాలానికం కరుగానంతి చాలాంటూ కాలానికం కరుగానంతి చాలాంటూ కాలానికం కరుగానంతి

ప్రతిరుఖలు, ప్రామాణిక పరిపాలన వ్యతిరేక లభిస్తాంయి 4(1)(2)

- సాంసారి ప్రతిరుఖలు, విధ్య, అధికారాలు
- అధికారాలు కారుణిరాణలో ప్ాటించే సయత్తాలు
- నియమాల పుస్తకాలు, సమాచార సాంకేతిక సమాచారం
- ప్ాభమత్ి సాంసారి వదదు ఉన్న ఏదానా సమాచార మమ/దసాత వేజులు
- లబ్ధీదారడల వివరాలు
- రాయితీలు, ప్రాతుల
- అన్నత్తులు ప్ాంద త్యులు నియమించండి/పరిశీలించండి

పరిశీలన 4(1)(v)

(17 ఎకరా)
స్ట్క్షన్స్ 4(1)(సీ)

(2) ప్రతి సంపాదన ప్రథమ గోడ చేసే సంస్థ (వర్గ పారిశ్రామిక) వ్యవసాయ

లేక రాష్ట్రంలో అధికారిక ప్రకటనలు ఉండి వినియోగదారుల వివిధ విభాగాలకు వాహించబడుతుంది.

స్ట్క్షన్స్ 4(1)(ం)

(3) స్ట్క్షన్స్ 4(2) పర్యాయానిక వ్యవస్థలు

వ్యవసాయ ప్రధానితకు సమాచారాన్ని సంపాదించడానికి సాధారణ వ్యవసాయ పరిషత్తు కృతిలో అందించబడింది.
మనిషి కదియతా?

చాలా సంవత్సరాల ప్రాంగణంలో ఇండియన్ బయోలా స్టాండింగ్ బిల్డింగ్ ఒక సమాధాన మరియు విధ్వంసం జరిపించింది. ఈ ప్రాంగణంలో ప్రాంగణకు యోగ్యంగా భాగం పెంచుకోవడానికి ప్రాంగణంలో యోగ్యాంగా భాగం పెంచుకోవడానికి ప్రాంగణంలో యోగ్యాంగా భాగం పెంచుకోవడానికి ప్రాంగణంలో యోగ్యాంగా భాగం పెంచుకోవడానికి ప్రాంగణంలో యోగ్యాంగా భాగం పెంచుకోవడానికి ప్రాంగణంలో యోగ్యాంగా భాగం పెంచుకోవడానికి ప్రాంగణంలో యోగ్యాంగా భాగం పెంచుకోవడానికి ప్రాంగణంలో యోగ్యాంగా భాగం పెంచుకోవడానికి ప్రాంగణంలో యోగ్యాంగా భాగం పెంచుకోవడానికి ప్రాంగణంలో యోగ్యాంగా భాగం పెంచుకోవడానికి ప్రాంగణంలో యోగ్యాంగా భాగం పెంచుకోవడానికి ప్రాంగణంలో యోగ్యాంగా భాగం పెంచుకోవడానికి 

Professorsridhar@gmail.com

Fri, 23 June 2017
epaper.sakshi.com/e/20024366
రాష్ట్రసభ కార్యాలయం నుంచి..

117 తలాలలో 62,736 దినాని నిర్వాహించింది

ప్రపంచ నుండి ఆరోగ్యం మార్గం (ప్రరంభం) 117 తలాలలో 62,736 దినాని నిర్వాహించింది.

మాధ్యమిక మర్యాదల సంఖ్య (17)

ప్రదేశంలో మాధ్యమిక మర్యాదల సంఖ్య (2016-17)కు సమాధ్యమితి చేసిన సంఖ్య సంఖ్య 62,736 దినాని నిర్వాహించింది.

మాధ్యమిక మర్యాదల సంఖ్య (2012-17) మాదిరి సంఖ్య సంఖ్య 28,777 దినాని నిర్వాహించింది.

2007-08 సంఖ్య సంఖ్య సంఖ్య 28,777 దినాని నిర్వాహించింది.

సంకల్పం కోసం ఈ మాధ్యమిక మర్యాదల సంఖ్య సంఖ్య సంఖ్య 28,777 దినాని నిర్వాహించింది.

మాధ్యమిక మర్యాదల సంఖ్య సంఖ్య సంఖ్య 28,777 దినాని నిర్వాహించింది.

మాధ్యమిక మర్యాదల సంఖ్య సంఖ్య సంఖ్య 28,777 దినాని నిర్వాహించింది.

మాధ్యమిక మర్యాదల సంఖ్య సంఖ్య సంఖ్య 28,777 దినాని నిర్వాహించింది.

మాధ్యమిక మర్యాదల సంఖ్య సంఖ్య సంఖ్య 28,777 దినాని నిర్వాహించింది.
GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION (I&PR-II)DEPARTMENT


Sub: RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT,2005 – Section 22 of Act, 2005 (Central Act) – obligation under sections 4(1)(a)/4(1)(b) and under section 5 of the Act – Certain Instructions - ISSUED.


*****

All the District Collectors & Magistrates are informed that the Right to Information Bill, 2005 as passed by the Houses of Parliament received the assent of the President of India on 15.6.2005 and it was published as RTI Act-2005 in the Gazette of India on 21.6.2005. A copy of the Act has already been furnished to them in the reference cited. It has come into force with effect from 15.06.2005.
6. The Act casts an obligation under section 5 on each public authority to designate the following, in all administrative units and offices under it, by 22.9.2005 (i.e., with in 100 days from the date of enactment of the Act.):

a. State Asst. Public Information Officer under Section 5(2) of the Act to receive applications for information or appeals under the Act to forward the same forthwith either to State Public Information Officer or to the Office who is senior to the State Public Information Officer.

b. State Public Information Officer under Section 5(1) of the Act to provide information with in the time limit specified in the Act.

c. Officer who is senior to the rank of State Public Information Officer to receive the applications for information or appeals sent by State Assistant Public Information Officer as contemplated under Sub Section (1) of Section 19 of the act to dispose with in the time frame stipulated in the Act in each Public Authority.
7. In compliance with the above statutory obligations, all the secretariat departments should immediately take the following action:

a. to make every office in the district, of every department of the Government of Andhra Pradesh, at district, sub-divisional and mandal levels, to maintain records as prescribed in section 4(1) (a).

b. to make every office in the district, of every department of the Government of Andhra Pradesh, at district, sub-divisional and mandal levels, to publish manuals on or before 12.10.2005, as prescribed in section 4(1) (b).

c. to make every office in the district, of every department of the Government of Andhra Pradesh, at district, sub-divisional and mandal levels, to designate by 23.09.2005.

I. “State Public Information Officer” under Section 5(1) of the Act.
II. “State Assistant Public Information Officer” under Section 5(2) of the Act.
III. “Officer who is senior to the State Public Information Officer” to receive applications for information or appeals sent by State Assistant Public Information Officers under Sub Section (1) of Section 19 of the Act.

d. To bring to the notice of every public authority in the district coming under the purview of the definition of Public Authority under section 2(h) of the Act, to take action on the lines of sub-paras(a), (b), (c) above.

MOHAN KANDA
CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
వైఎస్ఏ. ప్రైమరీ హిస్టరీ
చేపల: ప్రపంచ వివిధాలలో, ప్రకాశం జిల్లా, ప్రకాశం జిల్లా – 523001.
ఫోన్ నం: 08592 231223.
ఫ�యాక్స్ నం: 8886616004.
ఇమేయిల్: prkdro@gmail.com

అపేక్షా ప్రాంయపత్రిక ప్రభుత్వ అధికారి
PIO

క్షేత్ర ప్రాంయపత్రిక ప్రభుత్వ అధికారి
APIO

మహాప్రాంయ ప్రమాణపత్రిక ప్రభుత్వ అధికారి
1st AA

సెక్షన్ 5 (1) పరిపాలన ప్రభుత్వ అనుమతి, సెక్షన్ 5 (2) పరిపాలన ప్రభుత్వ అనుమతి, సహాయప్రాంయపత్రిక ప్రభుత్వ అనుమతి, సెక్షన్ 19 (1) పరిపాలన ప్రభుత్వ అనుమతి, లాభ వారి కారాలు ప్రకాశం జిల్లా కలెక్టరు వారి కారాలు ప్రకాశం జిల్లా. సమాచారహక్యదాం చటరాం - 2005.
(3) వైద్య తరపు కలిపం.

(4) నితి, విధానముల మిదం కదల విధానం (సంఖ్య 30. 
మద్యంలో) లభి.

(5) విధానం ధరారాయి కదల విధానం ప్రత్యేక లభి.

(6) వైద్య మంతా/ సిద్ధం సమాధానం లభి యేది 
ప్రతి ప్రాంతంలో సరి.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Organization:
The Revenue Department is a unit in the Andhra Pradesh Secretariat Organization in the Andhra Pradesh Government. The Revenue Department is headed by 2 Special Chief Secretaries. The Department oversees/supervises the functions relating to the matters of Government Lands, Excise, Commercial Tax, Registrations, Survey and Settlements, Endowments etc., in the State of Andhra Pradesh. The organogram of the Department is shown in the Annexure.

Objective:
The Revenue Department is an integral part of Government of Andhra Pradesh and administers matters pertaining to Government Lands, Excise, Commercial Tax, Registrations, Survey and Settlements etc., within the jurisdiction of State of Andhra Pradesh. The key to Objective behind publication of this information manual is to enable the public to understand the role played by the Department in the general administration of Government of Andhra Pradesh. As prescribed under section 4(1)(b) of the Act, the Revenue Department being the public authority, hereby publishes the prescribed information relating to constitution, functioning of the Department. The matter contained in this manual is meant for information of general public. Apart from these, the citizens are entitled under the Act, to obtain information required from the Department. Procedure for obtaining information from the Department prescribed in the following paragraphs.

Right to Information Act:
The Right to Information Act, 2005 of Parliament received the assent of the President of India. The Act provides for setting out the practical regime of Right to Information for citizens to secure access to information under the control of Public authorities, in order to promote transparency and accountability in the working of every public authority. In accordance with section 4(1)(b) of the RTI Act, 2005 the Manual information handbook is prepared for the use of public.

Intended users of the information handbook:
Citizens, Civil Society Organizations, Public representatives, Officers and employees of Public Authorities including Public Information Officers and assistant Public Information Officers and Appellate Officers, Central and State Information Commissions etc.

Organization of Information:
The information pertaining to organization and functioning of the Department. If any person is desirous of obtaining any other information, he shall make an information request to the PIO. The applicant is required to comply with the following conditions:
The applicant shall be a citizen of India
- As proof of citizenship, any one of the following
- Documents may be attached to the information request.
  - Ration Card
  - PAN card
  - Driving license
  - Electricity bill/Telephone Bill / House Tax Bill / Property Tax Bill
  - Passport document
- The information request shall be made in writing
- The request can also be addressed in electronic format to PIO at the email address mentioned. The information request can be in one of the following three languages
  - Telugu
  - Hindi
  - English
- Applicant shall pay the prescribed fee (which will notified shortly)
- Applicants belonging to Below Poverty Line (BPL) category need not pay the fee. For claiming from payment of fee under BPL category, the applicant shall attach one of the following documents as proof his belonging to BPL category—Ration card. The request for information will be generally processed within the time period mentioned under the Act.

The Rules, Instructions, Documents, Manuals, Acts & Policies of the this Department referred at different instances are available in the office of the Revenue Department and some of them are also available as a link in the Web site www.aponline.gov.in

More information can be had from the concerned wing Officers or the State Public Information Officer/Asst Public Information Officer of the Department at free of cost or by paying the prescribed fee if any.
OFFICE MEMORANDUM


The undersigned is directed to say that the High Court of Bombay at Goa in the above referred case has held on 3.4.2008 that the term ‘information’ as defined in the Right to Information Act does not include answers to the questions like ‘why’. The relevant part of the judgement is reproduced below:

“The definition of information cannot include within its fold answers to the question ‘why’ which would be same thing as asking the reason for a justification for a particular thing. The public information authorities cannot expect to communicate to the citizen the reason why a certain thing was done or not done in the sense of a justification because the citizen makes a requisition about information. Justifications are matter within the domain of adjudicating authorities and cannot properly be classified as information.”

2. This may be brought to the notice of all concerned.

(K.G. Verma)
Director
Tel: 23092158

1. All the Ministries / Departments of the Government of India
2. Union Public Service Commission/ Lok Sabha Secretariat/ Rajya Sabha Secretariat/ Cabinet Secretariat/ Central Vigilance Commission/ President’s Secretariat/ Vice-President’s Secretariat/ Prime Minister’s Office/ Planning Commission/Election Commission.
4. Staff Selection Commission, CGO Complex, New Delhi
5. O/o the Comptroller & Auditor General of India, 10, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi.
6. All officers/Desks/Sections, DOP&T and Department of Pension & Pensioners Welfare.

Copy to: Chief Secretaries of all the States/UTs.
GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH

ABSTRACT


GENERAL ADMINISTRATION (COORDINATION., GPM&AR) DEPARTMENT

G.O.Rt.No.6488

Dt.20–11-2006

Read the following:-

**PROFORMA**

**ANNEXURE – II**

**REGISTER - I**

Register of Applications received and disposed of under RTI Act by the Public Information Officer (Maintained by P.I.O)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No</th>
<th>Application No &amp; Date</th>
<th>Name of Applicant &amp; Address</th>
<th>Date of Receipt by APIO / PIO</th>
<th>Category of Applicant BPL / Other</th>
<th>Brief Description of request for information</th>
<th>Involving Third party information or Not</th>
<th>Amount for application fees paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No</th>
<th>Application No &amp; Date</th>
<th>Name of Applicant &amp; Address</th>
<th>Date of Receipt by APIO / PIO</th>
<th>Category of Applicant BPL / Other</th>
<th>Brief Description of request for information</th>
<th>Involving Third party information or Not</th>
<th>Amount for application fees paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Charges collected for furnishing information in Rs.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No</th>
<th>Total Amount Collected (Col.8+Col.9)</th>
<th>Information Furnished Date</th>
<th>Fully</th>
<th>Partly</th>
<th>Date of Rejection</th>
<th>Sections under 8,9,11,24 which information Rejected</th>
<th>Deemed Refusal u/s 7(2) / 18(1)</th>
<th>Whether Appeal made against decision of PIO u/s 19(1) &amp; 19(3)</th>
<th>Any other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**REGISTER - II**

Register of First Appeals maintained by the 1st Appellate Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No</th>
<th>Appeal No. &amp; Date</th>
<th>Name of Appellant &amp; Address</th>
<th>Date of Receipt of Appeal by Appellate Authority</th>
<th>Name &amp; Designation of PIO against whose decision Appeal No. &amp; Date</th>
<th>Decision by 1st Appellate Authority</th>
<th>Whether 2nd Appeal made u/s 19(3)</th>
<th>Any other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ANNEXURE - III**

*(Proforma - A)*

**REPORT TO BE PREPARED BY P.I.O AND TO SUBMIT TO DIST. OFFICER**

CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT ON THE APPLICATIONS RECEIVED AND DISPOSED OF UNDER THE R.T.I.ACT

**PERIOD**

**NAME OF THE DEPARTMENT:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name &amp; Address of the PIO</th>
<th>Total No. of applications pending as on end of the last Month</th>
<th>Total No. of Applications received during the Month</th>
<th>Total (Cols.3+4)</th>
<th>Total No. of Applications disposed during the Month</th>
<th>Total No. of Applications pending (Cols.5-6)</th>
<th>Out of cases Disposed shown in Col.6, Information furnished</th>
<th>Out of cases Disposed shown in Col.6, Deemed Refusals u/s 7(2) / 18(1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Out of cases disposed shown in Col.No.(6), Cases rejected under Sections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>8(1)(a)</th>
<th>8(1)(b)</th>
<th>8(1)(c)</th>
<th>8(1)(d)</th>
<th>8(1)(e)</th>
<th>8(1)(f)</th>
<th>8(1)(g)</th>
<th>8(1)(h)</th>
<th>8(1)(i)</th>
<th>8(1)(j)</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>Amount of Total Application Fee and Charges collected for furnishing information</th>
<th>Any other information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SIGNATURE:**

NAME OF THE OFFICER:

DESIGNATION:

TELEPHONE No:

**Note:**

1. This consolidated report to be prepared at the level of PIO and to submit to District Officer of his Dept.
2. Each District Officer will collect information from their PIOs under their control and prepare a consolidated statement including his department’s information for submission to the HOD.
3. Each HOD will collect information from their District Level Officers, Zonal / Regional Offices if any, under their control and prepare a consolidated statement including HOD’s information and submit to the Secretariat Department concerned.
4. Each Secretariat Department shall collect information from the HODs and other units under their control and prepare a consolidated statement including its department’s information and provide the same to Andhra Pradesh Information Commission.
హీన నామచారు అందరి మధ్యమం {ఇ.6(1)}

1) సమాచారాం అడగటని కారణాలు చాలా సమయం లక్షించేందుకు నామకారు గొప్పేదు.

2) మార్గం సంయుక్తమైన అంకీల విధానం లేదు. అందుకు నంది నిలిచేదు.

3) పంపస్తుల పదార్థాలు విశేష అభిమంచింది.

4) సమాచారాం మార్గం మధ్యలో విశేషాలు నిలిచింది. సమాచారాల మార్గంలో విశేషాలు ఉంది.
CIRCULAR U. O. NOTE NO.14225

GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION (GPM&AR) DEPARTMENT

Circular U.O. Note No.14225/RTI/GPM & AR/10 - 1, Dt: 05.06.2010.

Sub:- RTI Act, 2005 – Acknowledgement of RTI applications received by APICs and PIOs under RTI Act and issuance of proper receipt to the applicants – Certain instructions issued.

Ref:- Right to Information Act, 2005.

***

All Departments of Secretariat / Heads of Departments / District Collectors are informed that the Officers / staff in-charge of receiving the applications filed under Right to Information Act, 2005 should acknowledge receipt of the same, and this acknowledgment should clearly indicate the application receiver’s name, designation and date. However, a few instances have come to the notice of the Government that the Officers / staff in-charge of receiving applications have refused to acknowledge receipt of the applications. Such a refusal to acknowledge receipt of the application goes against the very spirit of the RTI Act. A part from receiving and acknowledging the applications, the applicants have also to be guided properly in filing the application by the APIC / PIO and others, if any, concerned.

2. All Departments of Secretariat / HODs / District Collectors are, therefore, requested to issue strict instructions to all concerned under their control to give acknowledgment receipt of all the applications filed under RTI Act, 2005.

S.BHALE RAO
SPL.CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

To:
All the Spl.C.S.’s / Prl.Secy’s / Secys to Government,
All the Departments of Secretariat
All the HODs
All the District Collectors

Copy To:-
The Secretary,
A.P. Information Commission,
HACA Bhavan,
Hyderabad.
The Director General,
Dr.MCHRDI of A.P.,
Road No.25, Jubilee Hills,
Hyderabad – 500 033.
The Director General & Executive Director,
Centre for Good Governance,
Dr.MCHRDI of AP Campus,
Road No.25, Jubilee Hills,
Hyderabad – 500 033.
Sri B.V.Ramana Rao,
Plot No.1
Vinayaknagar,
Opp.Bhasayam Public School,
Ring Road,
Vizianagaram District. (for Information)

RECEIVED
3 0 NOV 2019
GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION (GPM&AR) DEPARTMENT


Sub: - RTI Act, 2005- Complaint on Non-acceptance of fee by cash clarification – Regarding.

2. From the OSD, APIC, Lr. No. 2726/APIC/07, Dt. 23.5.2007.

 ****

The attention of all the Departments of Secretariat is invited to the reference 1st cited wherein Rules have been issued under Section 27 of RTI Act, 2005 to provide information to the Applicants:

The Rule ‘3’ provides that :

“3 Application fee to accompany request for obtaining information:

A request for obtaining information under sub-section (1) of section 6 shall be accompanied by an application fee by way of cash or by Demand Draft or by Bankers’ Cheque payable to the Accounts Officer or any other duly authorized officer of the Public authority, against proper receipt, at the following rates:-

a) in respect of public authorities at the Village Level – no fee;

b) in respect of public authorities at Mandal Level – Rs. 5/- per application.

c) in respect of public authorities other than those covered above – Rs. 10/- per application.”

2. Complaints are being received that some Public Information Officers (PIOs) are not accepting cash payment of Application fees. This is in violation of the above rules. All Departments may note the above and instruct their Subordinate Officers suitably.

JAGANNATH PRASAD MURTY
PRL. SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.
ప్రతి ప్రత్యేక మాధ్యమ మూలాలను చేసి పాఠపిండి కొరకు మాధ్యమ అద్భుతమైంది.

ప్రతిపాదన రూపాలను సూచించు నిర్ధిష్ట ప్రాబల్యం సూచించి, విశాల నామస్థలం సూచించండి.
No.F.10/2/2008-IR  
Government of India  
Ministry of Personnel, PG and Pensions  
Department of Personnel & Training  

North Block, New Delhi  
Dated September 24, 2010

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

Subject:- RTI applications received by a public authority regarding information concerning other public authority/authorities.

******

The undersigned is directed to refer to this Department’s OM of even number dated 12th June, 2008 on the above noted subject, clause [iii] of para 3 of which provides that if a person makes an application to the public authority for information, a part of which is available with the public authority and the rest of the information is scattered with more than one other public authorities, the Public Information Officer (PIO) of the public authority receiving the application should give information relating to it and advise the applicant to make separate applications to the concerned public authorities for obtaining information from them. It further provides that if no part of the information is available with the public authority receiving the application but scattered with more than one other public authorities, the PIO should inform the applicant that information is not available with the public authority and that the applicant should make separate application to the concerned public authorities for obtaining information from them.

2. The matter has been examined in consultation with the Chief Information Commissioner, Central Information Commission and it has been decided to advise the PIOs that if the details of public authorities who may have this information sought by the applicant are available with the PIO, such details may also be provided to the applicant.

3. Contents of this OM may be brought to the notice of all concerned.

[Signature]  
Director  
Tel. 2309 2158

1. All the Ministries/Departments of the Government of India  
2. Union Public Service Commission/Lok Sabha Secretariat/Rajya Sabha Secretariat/Cabinet Secretariat/Central Vigilance Commission/President’s
విషయం: అక్కడ మహిళులు లోపంలో లేదా మనదంతా ప్రతిష్ఠాన లో ప్రతిష్ఠానం విడిన శాతాదు (రేఖ. 6(3))

3) ప్రత్యేకంగా రేఖాగొండలతో భాగితే ఆధారం మొడలు ఊపాదకం పెంచాలి.

4) అన్న పురుష ఎందుకంటే అవసరమైన సమస్యలను సాధించండి.

5) ప్రత్యేకంగా విశేషాలు తెలియతా భాగం మొడలు ఊపాదకం పెంచాలి (అతి ప్రత్యేకం) విద్యా సంస్థ విద్యాంగం ప్రత్యేకించండి.
OFFICE MEMORANDUM

Subject:- RTI applications received by a public authority regarding information concerning other public authority/authorities.

The undersigned is directed to refer to this Department’s OM of even number dated 12th June, 2008 on the above noted subject, clause (iii) of para 3 of which provides that if a person makes an application to the public authority for information, a part of which is available with that public authority and the rest of the information is scattered with more than one other public authorities, the Public Information Officer (PIO) of the public authority receiving the application should give information relating to it and advise the applicant to make separate applications to the concerned public authorities for obtaining information from them. It further provides that if no part of the information is available with the public authority receiving the application but scattered with more than one other public authorities, the PIO should inform the applicant that information is not available with the public authority and that the applicant should make separate application to the concerned public authorities for obtaining information from them.

2. The matter has been examined in consultation with the Chief Information Commissioner, Central Information Commission and it has been decided to advise the PIOs that if the details of public authorities who may have this information sought by the applicant are available with the PIO, such details may also be provided to the applicant.

3. Contents of this OM may be brought to the notice of all concerned.

(K.G. Verma)
Director
Tel. 2309 2158

1. All the Ministries/Departments of the Government of India
2. Union Public Service Commission/Lok Sabha Secretariat/Rajya Sabha Secretariat/Cabinet Secretariat/Central Vigilance Commission/President’s
స్ట్క్షన్స్ నియమం ప్రక్కల్లో రెండవ సాంఘాతిక౮ సంఖ్య సమాచార వ్యవస్థను (7.7) (1)

(1) 30 రోజుల సమాచార లేదా వరాలి.
(2) ఇండి అక్షయం ప్రారంభించడం ఉండాలి మరియు 48 రోజుల వరకు సమాచార లేదా వరాలి.
(3) ప్రతి సంవత్సరం సమాచార ప్రారంభించడం కాబోద మరియు సంచారం వ్యవస్థ ప్రారంభించడం ఉండండి.
(4) సమాచార వ్యవస్థను ప్రారంభించడం ద్వారా మరియు వైమాచారం ప్రారంభించడం ఉండండి. (7.7) (3)
2. Definitions

In these rules, unless the context otherwise requires:

(a) 'State' means the State of Andhra Pradesh;
(b) 'Act' means, the Right to Information Act, 2005;
(c) 'Section' means, section of the Act;
(d) 'Commission' means, the State Information Commission, constituted under Section 15(1) of the Act;
(e) All other words and expressions used herein but not defined and defined in the Act shall have the meanings assigned to them in the Act.

3. Application fee to accompany request for obtaining information

A request for obtaining information under sub-section (1) of Section 6 shall be accompanied by an application fee by way of cash or by demand draft or by bankers' Cheque payable to the Accounts Officer or any other duly authorized officer of the Public Authority, against proper receipt, at the following rates:

- in respect of public authorities at the Village Level – no fee;
- in respect of public authorities at Mandal Level – Rs. 5/- per application;
- in respect of public authorities other than those covered above – Rs. 10/- per application.

4. Fee to be charged for providing information

Fees for providing information under sub-section (1) or sub-section (5) of Section 7, a fee shall be charged, by way of cash or demand draft or bankers' Cheque, payable to the Accounts Officer or any other duly authorized officer of the Public Authority, against proper receipt, at the following rates:

- Priced material:
  Publications printed matter, text, maps, plans, floppies, CDs, samples, models or material in any other form, which are priced, the sale price thereof;
- Other than priced material:
  (i) Material in printed or text form (in A4 or A3 size paper) Rs. 2/- per each page per copy;
  (ii) Material in printed or text form in larger than A4 or A3 size paper actual cost thereof;
  (iii) Maps and Plans – actual cost thereof;
  (iv) Information in Electronic format viz., Floppy, CD or DVD:
    - rupees fifty for Floppy of 1.44 MB;
    - rupees one hundred for CD of 700 MB and;
    - rupees two hundred for CD (DVD);
  (v) Samples and models – actual cost thereof;
  (vi) Inspection of records – no fee for the first hour; and a fee of rupees five for each fifteen minutes (or fraction thereof) thereafter;
  (vii) Material to be sent by post – the actual postal charges in addition to the charge payable as per these rules.

A.K. GOYAL,
Spl. Chief Secretary to Government
(GPM & I.R, Co-ordination) (FAC).

Printed and Published by the Commissioner of Printing, Government of Andhra Pradesh at Government Central Press, Hyderabad.
AMENDMENT TO ANDHRA PRADESH INFORMATION (REGULATION OF FEE AND COST) RULES 2005.

[G.O.Ms.No.545, General Administration (I & PR-II),
12th December 2005.]

In exercise of the powers conferred by clauses (b) and (c) of sub-section (2) of Section 27 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (Central Act 22 of 2005), the Government of Andhra Pradesh hereby makes the following amendment to the Andhra Pradesh Right to Information (Regulation of Fee and Cost) Rules, 2005 issued in G.O.Ms.No. 454, General Administration (I & PR. II) Department dated 13th October, 2005 and published in Rules Supplement to Part-I Extraordinary issue of the Andhra Pradesh Gazette dated 13-10-2005.
OFFICE-MEMORANDUM

Subject: Payment of fee under the Right to Information Act, 2005 — scope of sub-section (3) of Section 7 of the Act.

The Undersigned is directed to say that a question is raised from time to time whether a Public Information Officer (PIO) has power to charge fee under Section 7(3) of the RTI Act, 2005 in addition to fee prescribed under Sections 6(1), 7(1) and 7(5) of the Act.

2. Section 6(1) of the Act enables the Government to prescribe application fee and sub-sections (1) and (5) of Section 7 to prescribe fee in addition to fee for application for supply of information. On the other hand sub-section (3) of Section 7 provides the procedure which a PIO has to follow for realizing the fee prescribed under sub-sections (1) and (5) of the Section. Details of fees that can be charged by a public authority under the Central Government are contained in the Right to Information (Regulation of Fee & Cost) Rules, 2005. The Rules or the Act do not give power to the PIO to charge any fee other than prescribed in the Fee and Cost Rules. Attention in this regard is invited to following extract from the common order passed by the Central Information Commission in Appeal No. CIC/MA/A/2008/0185 (Shri K.K. Kishore Vs. Institute of Company Secretaries of India) and Complaint No.CIC/WB/C/2007/00843 (Shri Subodh Jain Vs. Dy. Commissioner of Police):

“The Act under proviso to sub-section (5) of Section 7 also provides that fee prescribed under sub-sections (1) and (5) of Section 7 shall be reasonable and no such fee shall be charged from the persons who are below poverty line as may be determined by the Appropriate Government. The Government has already prescribed fees as deemed reasonable mandated under Sections 7(1) and 7(5) of the Act and in the view of the Commission, there is no provision for any further fee apart from the one already prescribed under Sections 7(1) and 7(5) of the Act”.

3. The Commission, while delivering decision in above cases, recommended to this Department to make rules, for charging fee towards supply of information which may include fee for supply of books, maps, plans, documents, samples, models etc. that are priced and towards postal/courier charges for mailing information, when postal/courier charges are in excess of minimum charge prescribed by the Department of Posts and for other similar situations.

4. The Right to Information (Regulation of Fee & Cost) Rules, 2005 already provide provisions for charging of fee for giving information in diskettes or floppy discs or in the form of photo copy; for providing samples, models, printed material like books, maps, plans etc; and for inspection of records. The Government have, however, not considered it desirable to charge fee towards transportation involved in mailing information or overhead expenditure etc. Nevertheless, supply of information in a form which would disproportionately divert the resources of the public authority is taken care of by Section 7(9) of the Act according to which information shall be provided in the form in which it is sought but supply of information in a particular form may be refused if supply of information in that form would divert the resources of the public authority disproportionately.

5. It is hereby clarified that where a Public Information Officer takes a decision to provide information on payment of fee in addition to the application fee, he should determine the quantum of such fee in accordance with the fee prescribed under the Fee and Cost Rules referred to above and give the details of such fee to the applicant together with the calculation made to arrive at such fee. Since the Act or the Rules do not provide for charging of fee towards postal expenses or cost involved in deployment of man power for supply of information etc., he should not ask the applicant to pay fee on such account. However, wherever supply of information in a particular form would disproportionately divert the resources of the public authority or would be detrimental to the safety or preservation of the records, the PIO may refuse to supply the information in that form.
The Karnataka Right to Information Rules, 2005.

(2)(a) For providing information under subsection (1) of section 7, the fees for supplying the information shall be charged at Rs.2/- for each page in respect of matters in A4 size paper.

[(aa) for providing information disseminated under sub-section (4) of section 4 shall be rupee one per page in respect of matter in A4 size:][1]


(b) For providing information under subsection (1) of section 7, in the case of Maps, Plans, Reports, a Partial record or any Technical data or Sample or Models, a reasonable fee shall be fixed by the State Public Information Officer in each case depending upon the cost of labour and material required to be employed.

(c) As regards inspection of records and documents, no fee for the first hour. For every subsequent half an hour [or fraction thereof, rupees ten] shall be charged from persons making application with initial payment as prescribed under rule 4(1) above. For inspection of works a reasonable fee shall be fixed by the State Public Information Officer in each case depending upon the cost of labour and material required to be employed apart from initial fees as prescribed under rule 4(1).


(3) For providing information under sub-section (5) of section 7, the fees for supplying information in Diskette or Floppy or C.D. or in any other Electronic mode shall be Rs. 50/-.  

(4) The fee shall be collected in the form of Indian postal order or D.D. or Bankers Cheque or Pay order drawn in favour of the State Public Information Officer or in cash or by remitting it to the Treasury as per Karnataka Financial Code (KFC).

(5) A person claiming exemption under proviso to sub-section (5) of section 7 shall produce a valid certificate issued by the concerned authority that he/she belongs to the Below Poverty Line category.

["(6) In case of below poverty line card holders, if the information requested for is within one hundred pages, no fee shall be chargeable. In case, the information sought exceeds one hundred pages, the Public Information Officers may allow inspection of the required documents, charging fee under clause (c) of sub-rule (2) or the information be furnished on payement of prescribed fee as provided under clause (aa) of sub-rule (2)];[1]

ORDER

Sri P. Balaraju filed this 2nd Appeal dated 13-12-2014 which was received by this Commission on 17-12-2014 for not getting the information sought by him from the PIO and the 1st AA.

The brief facts of the case as per the Appeal and other records received along with it are that the Appellant filed an Application dated 13-06-2014 before the PIO requesting to furnish the information under Sec. 6(1) of the RTI Act-2005, on the points mentioned in his Application.

Since the Appellant did not receive the information from the Public Information Officer, he filed 1st Appeal dated 17-09-2014 before the 1st Appellate Authority requesting to furnish the information under Sec. 19(1) of the RTI Act-2005.

The Appellant stated that as he did not receive the desired information from the 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 furnish the information sought by him and also to arrange to furnish the information sought by u/s of the RTI Act-2005.

The 2nd Appeal is taken on file and notices were issued to both the parties to appear for hearing to be held on 28-02-2015.

The Case is called on 28-02-2015. The Appellant is called absent. The PIO and 1st AA are called present.

The PIO submitted to the Commission that the appellant seeking the information free of cost which is against the provisions of the RTI Act 2005.

The Appellant contended in his 2nd appeal that he is under BPL so, the respondents should furnish the information free of cost.

The Commission advised the appellant that only for submitting 6(1) application the white ration card holders may not pay the fee but, to get the required information as per the rules of A.P. Government should pay the Xerox charges Rs.2/- per page.

With the above fact the case is closed.

P. Vijaya Babu,
State Information Commissioner

Authenticated by:

(G.Dinsha Babu)
Asst. Registrar
Copy to: - The SO / SF
CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

F.No.CIC/AT/C/2006/00069
Dated, the 31st January, 2007.

Appellant : Shri A.K. Mohanty, IPS, Commissioner of Police, Hyderabad City, Qr.No.47, Panagutta Officers Colony, Hyderabad-500082.

Respondents : Shri Jishnu Barua, Director (Police) & CPIO, Ministry of Home Affairs, North Block, New Delhi-110 001.
Shri V.N. Gaur, Joint Secretary (Police) & Appellate Authority, Ministry of Home Affairs, North Block, New Delhi-110 001.

the legal forums which are reported and documented in various legal journals, and are, therefore, easily available to the public”.

Decision

There is merit in the conclusions of the AA. However, one way to overcome this problem of substantial diversion of resources of the public authority in photocopying and supplying to the appellant a sizeable number of documents could be to use more advanced technologies for copying the documents.

The appellant may, if he so chooses, use advanced camera technologies by using his own resources to copy these documents. He may within 2 weeks from the date of the receipt of this order submit the alternative proposal to the respondents for copying of these documents who will consider the same and pass an order within 2 weeks from the date of the receipt of the proposal from the appellant. The AA shall also give a hearing to the appellant on a specified day and time.

The appeal is disposed of with the above directions.

Sd/-
(A.N. TIWARI)
INFORMATION COMMISSIONER

Authenticated by –

Sd/-
(NISHA SINGH)
Joint Secretary & Additional Registrar

Address of parties:

1. Shri A.K. Mohanty, IPS, Commissioner of Police, Hyderabad City, Qr.No.47, Panagutta Officers Colony, Hyderabad-500082.

2. Ms. Inderjeet Kaur, Director (Police) & CPIO, Ministry of Home Affairs, North Block, New Delhi-110 001.

3. Shri V.N. Gaur, Joint Secretary (Police) & Appellate Authority, Ministry of Home Affairs, North Block, New Delhi-110 001.
OFFICE MEMORANDUM

Subject: Clarification regarding format in which the 'information' should be supplied under the RTI Act, 2005.

It has been observed that some people under the Right to Information Act, 2005 request the Public Information Officers (PIO) to cull out information from some document(s) and give such extracted information to them. In some cases, the applicants expect the PIO to give information in some particular proforma devised by them on the plea that sub-section (9) of Section 7 provides that an information shall ordinarily be provided in the form in which it is sought. It need be noted that the sub-section simply means that if the information is sought in the form of photocopy, it shall be provided in the form of photocopy and if it is sought in the form of a floppy, it shall be provided in that form subject to the conditions given in the Act etc. It does not mean that the PIO shall re-shape the information.

2. According to section 2(f) of the Act 'information' means 'any material in any form'. A citizen, under the Act, has a right to get 'material' from a public authority which is held by or under the control of that public authority. The right includes inspection of work, documents, records; taking notes, extracts or certified copies of documents or records; taking certified samples of material; taking information in the form of diskettes, floppies, tapes video cassettes or in any other electronic mode or through printouts where such information is stored in a computer or in any other device. Careful reading of the definition of 'information' and 'right to information' makes it clear that a citizen has a right to get the material, inspect the material, take notes from the material, take extracts or certified copies of the material, take samples of the material, take the material in the form of diskettes etc. The PIO is required to supply such material to the citizen who seeks it. The Act, however, does not require the Public Information Officer to deduce some conclusion from the 'material' and supply the 'conclusion' so deduced to the applicant. The PIO is required to supply the 'material' in the form as held by the public authority and is not required to do research on behalf of the citizen to deduce anything from the material and then supply it to him.

3. Contents of this OM may be brought to the notice of all concerned.

(K.G. Verma)
Director
No.1/18/2011-IR
Government of India
Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions
Department of Personnel & Training

*****

North Block, New Delhi
Dated: the 6th September, 2011


*****

The undersigned is directed to invite attention to this Department’s O.M. No.1/4/2009-IR dated 05.10.2009 whereby a Guide on the Right to Information Act, 2005 was circulated. Para 10 of Part I of the Guide, inter alia, stated that ‘only such information can be supplied under the Act which already exists and is held by the public authority or held under the control of the public authority. The Public Information Officer is not supposed to create information; or to interpret information; or to solve the problems raised by the applicants; or to furnish replies to hypothetical questions.’ The same issue has been elaborated by the Supreme Court in the matter of Central Board of Secondary Education & Anr. Vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay & Ors. (Civil Appeal No.6454 of 2011) as follows:

"At this juncture, it is necessary to clear some misconceptions about the RTI Act. The RTI Act provides access to all information that is available and existing. This is clear from a combined reading of section 3 and the definitions of ‘information’ and ‘right to information’ under clauses (f) and (j) of section 2 of the Act. If a public authority has any information in the form of data or analysed data, or abstracts, or statistics, an applicant may access such information, subject to the exemptions in section 8 of the Act. But where the information sought is not a part of the record of a public authority, and where such information is not required to be maintained under any law or the rules or regulations of the public authority, the Act does not cast an obligation upon the public authority, to collect or collate such non available information and then furnish it to an applicant. A public authority is also not required to furnish information which require drawing of inferences and/or making of assumptions. It is also not required to provide ‘advice’ or ‘opinion’ to an applicant, nor required to obtain and furnish any ‘opinion’ or ‘advice’ to an applicant. The reference to ‘opinion’ or ‘advice’ in the definition of ‘information’ in section 2(f) of the Act, only refers to such material available in the records of the public authority. Many public authorities have, as a public relation exercise, provide advice, guidance and opinion to the citizens. But that is purely voluntary and should not be confused with any obligation under the RTI Act."

3. This may be brought to the notice of all concerned.

(K.G. Verma)
Joint Secretary(RTI)
Tel: 23092158

1. All the Ministries / Departments of the Government of India
2. Union Public Service Commission/Lok Sabha Secrtt./Rajya Sabha Secretariat/
Cabinet Secretariat/ Central Vigilance Commission/ President's Secretariat/
Vice-President's Secretariat/ Prime Minister's Office/ Planning Commission/Election Commission.
4. Staff Selection Commission, CGO Complex, New Delhi
5. O/o the Comptroller & Auditor General of India, 10, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg,
New Delhi.
6. All officers/Desks/Sections, DOP&T and Department of Pension & Pensioners
Welfare.

Copy to: Chief Secretaries of all the States/UTs.
D.O.Letter No.28302/RTIA/GPM&AR/2010-1  Dt:13.08.2010

Dear

Sub:- RTI Act, 2005 – Display of Name Boards of Assistant Public Information Officers, Public Information Officers and Appellate Authorities as per Sec.5(1) of the Act – Regarding.


Kindly refer to the instructions issued in the references cited on display of Name Boards indicating the name, designation and office address of the Assistant Public Information Officers, Public Information Officers and Appellate Authorities at a prominent place in the Department.

2. During the recent Conference of Secretaries, the Chief Secretary had stressed the need for ensuring the provisions of Sec.4(1) (b) and exhibition of the Name Boards of Assistant Public Information Officers, Public Information Officers and Appellate Authorities as required under Sec.5(1) & (2) of Right to Information Act, are strictly implemented. It is therefore necessary to ensure strict compliance of Sections 4(1) (b) and 5(1) (2) as well as regular updation of information at such intervals as may be required.

3. In view of the above, I request that the provisions of Sec.4(1)(b) and display of Name Boards containing name, designation and office address of the Assistant Public Information Officers, Public Information Officers and Appellate Authorities as required under section Sec.5(1) and (2) both in English and Telugu are strictly adhered to, and the fact intimated to this Department at the earliest.

4. I also draw your attention to sub-section (4) of section (4) which refers to dissemination of material in local language. Further, Section 6(1) of the Act also stipulates that a person shall make a request to obtain information in English, Hindi and in the official language of local area in which the application is made. Therefore, information is to be provided to the applicants in the language in which the application is made. You may therefore kindly issue appropriate instructions immediately to all concerned under the administrative control of your department, as indicate above.

5. This matter may please be accorded TOP PRIORITY.

Yours Sincerely,

(MINNIE MATHEW)
On the basis of the above, we had directed Additional Registrar Shri L.C.Singhi of this Commission to visit the Office of the Director, Ministry of Environment & Forests and investigate the matter of non-location of files.

Accordingly, the Additional Registrar visited the office on 4.8.06. His report is as follows:

“A copy of the complaint petition was sent to the CPIO and Addl. Director of the Ministry of Environment and Forests, Govt. Of India fixing 4th August as the date of conducting the investigation. A letter posed under registered cover with acknowledgement due also informed the complainant about it. The complainant however, did not appear.

The Department concerned has produced records, which reveal the following:

1. The main file relating to environment clearance of Maheshwar HEP MP is not traceable since long.
2. There are altogether about 50 files, which are missing as a result of shifting of almirahs containing all records, and, in fact, one of the almirah is untraceable.
3. It was also submitted that adequate efforts have been made to trace out missing files and that the process is still on. However, the Addl. Director has submitted that it is not possible either to locate or reconstruct the file.
4. Ministry of Power has been requested vide D.O.No. J- 11016-12083/08-IA.I dated 21.6.06 (Copy placed below) to obtain the copies of letters/documents from their records so that the Public Authority can supply the copies to the complainant, Ms. Misha Singh.

In view of this, the misplacement of the file is a fact. It is also a fact that the records are neither cataloged nor indexed. The department does not know how many files are untraceable. It is really strange as to how one full almirah could get misplaced and becomes “untraceable”. However, prima facie there are no malafides. “

The matter was scheduled for hearing on 12.10.2006. Both parties had been informed by Notice of Hearing on Sept. 26, 2006 but neither appeared before us on the due date.

DEcision Notice

We have examined the file. With regard to the prayer at a) above, because as reported by the Investigating Officer the concerned files and indeed a whole almirah are untraceable, CPIO cannot be held responsible for any malafide in the non-supply of information to applicant Ms Misha Singh and this would amount to a reasonable cause for the delay/failure to supply. However, the principal matter of concern is the prayer at b) above. This is that a number of documents, which are held in public trust by the Department, have been admitted to have been mislaid. Simply stating that these are untraceable is not adequate excuse. If indeed, as suspected by the complainant, the files have actually been purloined this will amount to serious criminal act and its non-recovery a breach of trust on the part of the public authority. The Ministry of Environment & Forests will, therefore, immediately lodge a First Information Report (FIR) with the nearest Police Station to initiate criminal action against those responsible for this theft/loss. Notice of this decision be given free of cost to the parties.
Losing records a serious crime

One Balendra Kumar sought details of the file notings of all corresponding papers of a file, he gave the file number as well as the

Madhavshree Sridhar

In first appeal, a couple of papers were given. The CPIO said that the public records, which represent the missing file and even went to different sections of the departments concerned, is not available. The defence of missing file cannot be accepted even under the RTI Act. If the file is not available, the public authority is not to blame, but can do nothing to help. The Central Information Commission feels that lodging of FIR is not the best way to deal with this issue, as one cannot expect the police to come to the office and trace the file. According to law, police does not have any responsibility to trace the missing files, as they will come into picture only when there is theft of files, and the police should come to office and search for the files or things misplaced due to negligence or deliberate action by the police or by other authority. The duty of the PIO to make necessary efforts to trace the file and inform the same to the appellant in the form of an affidavit.

The public authority has a duty to designate “Public Records Officer” as per Public Records Act 1993. This Act institutes ado to regulate the protection, administration and preservation of public records. The definition of “Public Records” under the Public Records Act 1993 (PRA 1993) is almost identical with the definition of Records under the RTI Act 2005. These Records can be sought under the RTI Act, 2005 as “Information” through RTI Application. The National Archives of India, under the Culture Ministry, is responsible for keeping tabs on “public records,” and help government departments file a part of the records from those that must be saved. The documents considered to be “permanent nature” — like minutes of meetings, department which created them — are then shifted to the archives for safekeeping. These can be seen by research scholars. Loss of records that are required to be kept and maintained permanently, if considered as evidence in a case, should invite criminal complaint against officials under Sections 201 of IPC (punishable with imprisonment for life or making of false records or entries in public records). Otherwise, it might happen that the record is destroyed or destroyed.

The Right to Information Act cannot be effectively implemented without properly implementing the Public Records Act 1993. This Act mandates appointing officers as “Records Officers” in the department concerned must necessarily fix the responsibility for the loss of the record and take appropriate departmental action against the officials/officers responsible for the loss of the record. Since the Commission has the power to direct disclosure of information provided, it is quite possible that the record might have been destroyed. The Commission will have jurisdiction to direct an inquiry into the matter wherever it is necessary to determine whether the information sought by the applicant is not traceable/ready traceable/currently traceable. Even in a case where the PIO/CPIO takes a plea that the information sought by the applicant is not traceable, the Commission will have jurisdiction to direct an inquiry into the matter wherever it is necessary to determine whether the information sought by the applicant is not traceable/ready traceable/currently traceable.
• assisting the National Archives of India or, as the case may be, the Archives of the Union territory for public records management;
• submission of annual report to the Director General or, as the case may be, head of the Archives in such manner as may be prescribed;
• transferring of records of any defunct body to the National Archives of India or the Archives of the Union Territory, as the case may be, for preservation.

PRA 1993, Sec 7(1) The records officer shall, in the event of any unauthorized removal, destruction, defacement or alteration of any public record under his charge, forthwith take appropriate action for the recovery or restoration of such public records.

PRA 1993, S 9. Whoever contravenes any of the provisions of section 4 or section 8 shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to five years or with fine which may extend to ten thousand rupees or with both.

The public records act and rules ban government departments from destroying documents that are more than 25 years old, unless they have been "appraised".

8. The National Archives of India, under the Culture Ministry, and similar bodies at the State level are required to keep tabs on "public records", and help government departments separate worthless files from those that must be saved.

9. The documents considered to be of "permanent nature" — but no longer required by the department which created them — are then shifted to the archives for safekeeping. There, they can be seen by research scholars.

10. Loss of records that are required to be kept and maintained permanently, if considered as evidence in a case, its missing should invite criminal complaint against officials under sections 201 of IPC (punishable with imprisonment which is directly proportional to seriousness of offence charged from 7 years to 10 years and for life).

11. If these files are part of public record and forms evidence in any case, its destruction would be a serious crime of destruction of evidence. Otherwise also it brings in the liability under Public Records Act 1993 which can extend to imprisonment up to five years and up to fine of Rs 10,000. Reading Right to Information Act, 2005 with Public Records Act, 1993 and Indian Penal Code, will lead to serious consequences for those who lose the records, besides the disciplinary action from the top administration.

3. The Right to Information Act, cannot be effectively implemented without properly implementing the Public Records Act, 1993. But most of employees and their bosses do not know that a law called Public Records Act exist in this country. This Act mandates appointing an officer as 'Records Officer', similar to PIO under RTI Act. It is not known whether any authority was caring to follow this mandate. This Act says that the records officer shall, in the event of any unauthorized removal, destruction, defacement or alteration of any public records under his charge, forthwith take appropriate action for the recovery or restoration of such public records. In hundreds of cases of second appeals, this Commission could not find that any public authority has a record to
A.P. INFORMATION COMMISSION
(Under Right to Information Act, 2005)
Samachara Hakku Bhavan, D.No.5-4-399, ‘4’ Storied Commercial Complex, Housing Board Building, Mojam Jahi Market, Hyderabad – 500 001.
Phone Nos: 040-24740601 (O) / 24740109 (F)
Appeal No.17073/SIC-SPR/2013  Dated:29-10-2013
Name of the Appellant & Address Sri D. Kumar, C/o. Sridevi Narsing Home, opp. R&B Guest House, Kesamudram Mandal, Warangal District
Name of the Respondents Public Information Officer (U/RTI Act, 2005) The Tahsildar, Kesamudram Mandal, Warangal District 506 112
Appellate Authority (U/RTI Act, 2005) The Revenue Divisional Officer, Mahabubabad Division, Warangal District.

On 29-10-2013 the case is called. The Appellant is present. The Respondent, PIO / Tahsildar, Kesamudram Mandal, Warangal District is present. The 1st Appellate Authority is absent. The PIO represents that the appellant was informed on 10-5-2013 that the information sought is not available. The PIO represents that the appellant was informed that ROR, 13B file is not available. Informing that the file is not available does not absolve the PIO of his responsibility in furnishing information. It has become a fashion for the PIOs to simply inform the appellants that files are not traced / not available. They are not bothered to trace out files or rebuild records, even when the mistake lies with their office in causing disappearance of the file. The PIO is directed to trace out the file or conduct field enquiry and furnish information to the appellant within (15) days under intimation to this Commission. He will also report action taken against the concerned for causing disappearance of the file. The 1st Appellate Authority had failed to hear the case and pass appropriate orders on the 1st appeal filed before him. Issue Show Cause Notice, to the PIO for not furnishing information.
It follows from the above that PHFI is controlled and substantially financed by the Government. Therefore, this Commission rules that PHFI is a public authority under Section 2(h) of the RTI Act.

It is relevant to mention that the Respondent in its written submissions dated 29/01/2012 (i.e. after the hearing held on 24/01/2012) has now agreed to submit itself to the jurisdiction of the RTI Act. The Respondent has pleaded that it be granted a period of 60 days to comply with the provisions of the RTI Act. The Respondent-public authority has submitted that it believes in transparency and accountability, and has at all times complied with the substance of the RTI Act by responding in a proper and timely manner to all queries put to it under the RTI Act. Further, PHFI has also put up all relevant material and details pertaining to its functioning, activities, funding and finances (including extent of government funding) and details of members on its website. Given the above coupled with the fact that PHFI has already been in existence for six years, the Commission feels that PHFI should comply with the provisions of the RTI Act as expeditiously as possible. Therefore, the Commission is granting PHFI a period of 30 days to comply with the provisions of the RTI Act. It may not be out of place to mention that in recent years, there has been an emergence of a multitude of public-private partnerships in different sectors. As described above, PPPs envisage an arrangement between the Government and private entities with clearly laid down rights and obligations. By their very nature, PPPs stipulate certain contributions from the Government, which may be monetary as well as non-monetary-to which values can be attributed. Moreover, PPPs envisage a certain degree of Government control in their functioning so that the decisions taken are in accordance with the objectives for which the partnership was set up. Given the above, PPPs would come within the ambit of ‘public authorities’ as defined in the RTI Act thereby enabling citizens to know/obtain information about them. At present, most PPPs do not even accept the applicability of the RTI Act to them and wait for the issue to be adjudicated upon at the Commission’s level. For this some citizen has to pursue this matter. Such practices are required to be brought to a minimum and PPPs must comply with the provisions of the RTI Act. In this instance the Commission notes with some dismay that the highest levels of Public Servants in India did not accept the Citizen’s enforceable Right to Information in PHFI, despite the Government substantially funding it and exercising some control. This strengthens the plea by the Commission that all Public-Private partnership agreements must have a clause that they are substantially funded by the appropriate Government and hence accept that they are Public authorities as defined in the RTI Act. Without this, even an Institution like PHFI which has a distinguished Board, tries to refuse the Indian Citizen his enforceable fundamental right.
CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
Club Building (Near Post Office)
Old JNU Campus, New Delhi - 110067
Tel: +91-11-26101592

File No. CIC/BS/A/2012/001725
16 December 2015

Relevant Facts emerging from the Appeal:

Appellant:
Mr. Maniram Sharma
Nakul Niwas,
Behind Roadways Depot,
Sardarshahar,
District: Churu- 331403, Rajasthan

Respondent:
CPIO & Scientist “D”
M/o Communication & IT
National Informatics Centre
RTI Division
A-Block, CGO Complex,
Lohi Road, New Delhi - 110003

RTI application filed on:
24/05/2012
PIO replied on:
28/06/2012
First appeal filed on:
04/07/2012
First Appellate Authority order:
23/08/2012
Second Appeal received on:
23/10/2012

Information sought:
Please arrange to provide me the following information:-
1-Copy (in a CD) of all email addresses details of Govt/Public authorities/organizations maintained by NIC with up-to-date amendments therein.

Grounds for the Second Appeal:
The CPIO has not given the satisfactory information.

I. Relevant Facts emerging during Hearing:
The following were present
IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 07.01.2010

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K. CHANDRU

W.P.NO.20372 of 2009
and
M.P.NO.1 OF 2009

Public Information Officer/
Deputy Commissioner of
Archives and Historical Research,
Tamil Nadu Archives,
Egmore,
Chennai-8. .. Petitioner

Vs.

1.State Chief Information Commissioner,
Tamil Nadu Information Commission,
Kamadhenu Super Market 1st Floor,
Teynampet,
Chennai-18.
2.State Information Commissioner,
Tamil Nadu Information Commission,
Kamadhenu Super Market 1st Floor,
Teynempet,
Chennai-18.
3.S.Thanuskodi
Managing Director,
Kandamanur Zameen Wealth Developer,
Madurai-625 014. .. Respondents

11. Since the Commission under Section 8 is entitled to overrule any objection if larger public interest warrants disclosure of such information, the question of taking umbrage under the exemption clause will not arise. Any objection will have to be raised before the Commission by the Department of Archives or on notice by the archives the concerned department. Even then, the Commission can decide disclosure of such information was required in public interest. The Commission has clearly stated the so-called owner of the document can only be like a third party and subject to provisions of Section 11 of the RTI Act and that they can forward the objections made by the concerned department.

12. In so far as documents which are more than 20 years old, Section 8(3) itself declassifies those documents. The petitioner Tamil Nadu Archives is a "public authority" within a meaning of Section 2(h) of the RTI Act. Since they are empowered to retain records, subject to provisions of Sections 8 and 11, they cannot object to the disclosure of such information. Further, the Commission has safeguarded the interests of the concerned departments as they will be put on notice by the Archives about their objection in terms of law.

13. The other objections that they are maintaining a large number of documents in respect of 45 departments and they are short of human resources cannot be raised to whittle down the citizens’ right to seek information. It is for them to write to the Government to provide for additional staff depending upon the volume of requests that may be forthcoming pursuant to the RTI Act. It is purely an internal matter between the petitioner archives and the State Government. The right to information having been guaranteed by the law of Parliament, the administrative difficulties in providing information cannot be raised. Such pleas will defeat the very right of citizens to have access to information. Hence the objections raised by the petitioner cannot be countenanced by this court. The writ petition lacks in merit.
GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH

ABSTRACT

RTI Act, 2005 - Implementation of Section 8(3) - Time limit for information beyond 20 years - Furnishing of information relating to the occurrence, event or matter which took place 20 years back - Instructions - Issued.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION(RTIA/GPM&AR) DEPARTMENT


ORDER:-

Sub-section 3 of Section 8 of RTI Act, 2005 provides that 'Right to Information - Master key to Good Governance' has made the following recommendation on the time limit for information beyond twenty years -

"The stipulation of making available 20 year old records on request should be applicable only to those public records which need to be preserved for such a period. In respect of all other records, the period of availability will be limited to the period for which they should be preserved under the record keeping procedures."

2. The Second Administrative Reforms Commission in its First Report titled the 'Right to Information - Master key to Good Governance' has made the following recommendation on the time limit for information beyond twenty years -

3. The above recommendation of the Second Administrative Reforms Commission has been accepted by the Government. Accordingly, the following instructions are issued on implementation of Section 8(3) of RTI Act, 2005, in terms of the clarification issued by the Government of India vide their O.M read above.

(a) The meaning of Sub-Section (3) Section 8 is that the information which, in normal course, is exempted under Sub-Section (1) of section (8) of the Act, would cease to be exempted after 20 years of occurrence of the incident on which the information is sought and the information has to be provided to the applicants. However, the information under clauses (a) (c) & (i) of Sub-Section (1) of section (8) would continue to be exempted even after the lapse of 20 years. Therefore, the Information U/s 8(1) also has to be furnished by the Public Information Officer, if it is more than 20 years old and is available with him, except under clauses (a), (c) & (i).

(b) The RTI Act does not require the Public Authority to retain the records for indefinite period. The Record Retention Schedule applicable to the concerned Public Authority shall be followed. There is no need to retain the entire record beyond 20 years so as to provide information under Section 8(3). Information generated in a file may survive in the form of a G.O. or a letter or ...
THE HON’BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO
WRIT PETITION No.28752 of 2009
22.3.2010

Between:
Andhra Pradesh Housing Board, represented by its
Public Information Officer (under RTI Act 2005)
...Petitioner

and
The A.P. Information Commissioner (under RTI Act 2005)
and others
...Respondents

Section 8(1)(j) of RTI Act is yet another exception to Sections 3 and 7 of RTI Act. The application made by a person for allotment and allotment letter given to him/her can never be treated as “personal information” nor furnishing of such application would amount to invasion of privacy to individual. Whenever an issue arises whether information sought falls within Section 8(1)(j) of RTI Act is concerned, it should be tested with reference to the proviso thereto. According to the proviso, if the information sought cannot be denied to a Parliament or a State Legislature, the same cannot fall within the category as contemplated in Section 8(1)(j) of RTI Act. It is nobody’s case that the Housing Board will refuse applications and allotment letters even if the State Legislature summons them. The first respondent as well as Chief Information Commissioner have considered the matter in the light of the law and the same does not warrant any interference.
Office Memorandum

Subject: Format for giving information to the applicants under RTI Act - issue of guidelines regarding.

It has been observed that different public authorities provide information to RTI applicants in different formats. Though there cannot be a standard format for providing information, the reply should however essentially contain the following information:

(i) RTI application number, date and date of its receipt in the public authority.
(ii) The name, designation, official telephone number and email ID of the CPIO.
(iii) In case the information requested for is denied, detailed reasons for denial quoting the relevant sections of the RTI Act should be clearly mentioned.
(iv) In case the information pertains to other public authority and the application is transferred under section 6(3) of the RTI Act, details of the public authority to whom the application is transferred should be given.
(v) In the concluding para of the reply, it should be clearly mentioned that the First Appeal, if any, against the reply of the CPIO may be made to the First Appellate Authority within 30 days of receipt of reply of CPIO.
(vi) The name, designation, address, official telephone number and e-mail ID of the First Appellate Authority should also be clearly mentioned.

2. In addition, wherever the applicant has requested for ‘certified copies’ of the documents or records, the CPIO should endorse on the document “True copy of the document/record supplied under RTI Act”, sign the document with date, above a seal containing name of the officer, CPIO and name of public authority; as enumerated below:

| True copy of the document/record supplied under RTI Act. |
| Sd/- |
| Date |
| (Name of the Officer) |
| CPIO |
| (Name of the Public Authority) |

Further in case the documents to be certified and supplied is large in number, information on RTI application should be supplied by a designated PIO but the certification of the documents, if need be, could be done by an officer of a junior gazetted officer.

3. This may be brought to the notice of all concerned.

(G. S. Arora)
Deputy Secretary (IR)
Tel. 23052755

1. All the Ministries / Departments of the Government of India.
GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
GENER AL ADMINISTRATION (GPMSAR) DEPARTMENT

Circular U.O. Note No. 7490/RTIA/GPM & AR/2011
Dt: 30.4.2011.

Sub:- RTI Act, 2005 – Implementation of sub-section (3) of Section 7 of the Act – Intimation to pay additional fee for providing information within the fixed period – Instructions – Issued.

Ref:- From the Secretary, APIC, Lr.No.1811 / APIC / B / 2011, dt.19.02.2011.

The Secretary, Andhra Pradesh Information Commission in his letter in the reference cited, has reported that Public Information Officers after sending information asking the applicants to pay the fee are not taking further action and as a result the applicants are filing first appeals stating that the information sought for has not been furnished by the Public Information Officer and that the information be provided free of cost as laid down in sub-section (6) of Section 7 of the Act. In many cases the appellants are claiming that the communication asking them to pay the fee has not been received by them from the Public Information Officer within 30 days.

2. Sub-section (3) of Section 7 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (Act 12 of 2005) provides that where a decision is taken to provide the information on payment of any further fee representing the cost of providing the information, the Public Information Officer (PIO) shall send an intimation to the person making the request giving the details of further fee to be paid requesting him to deposit the fee. The period intervening between the despatch of the said information and payment of fee shall be excluded for the purpose of calculating the period of 30 days prescribed in sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the Act.

3. All Departments of Secretariat, all Heads of Departments and District Collectors are therefore requested to issue instructions to all Public Authorities under their administrative control to ensure that the communication asking for payment of further fees for providing information be sent by the Public Information Officer be sent well before 30 days of receipt of the application filed under sub-section 1 of Section 6 of the Act. It is advisable to send the communication by Registered Post with acknowledgement due, so as to enable Public Information Officer to have evidence of despatch of the Communication and also ensure that the communication reaches the applicant and complaints regarding non receipt of the Communication regarding payment of fee are avoided.

4. Further the Public Information Officer should indicate a reasonable time fixing a date by which the further fee has to be paid. In case the further fee is not paid within the time allowed, the Public Information Officer can take a decision to reject the application on the ground of non-payment of the further fee duly informing the applicant.

MINNIE MATHew
SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

To
All Deps of Secretariat.
All Heads of Departments.
All District Collectors.
Law (E) Dept.

Copy to:
The Secretary
A.P. Information Commission
HACA Bhavan
Hyderabad.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO GOVT.
పదమంచడం ఉరిగిన వాక్షాన్ లోపలలో వృందాది గానామలు లేదు

య) వ్యుత్పత్తి రాయలోపుడు గానామలు శాసనం అధికంగా మాత్రం వేస్తుంది.
నందం మాత్రం లేదా ఫండించిన సాధనాలు లేదా

6.7(6)

పదమంచడం ఉరిగిన రాయనషాం పదమంచడం కోసం

పదమంచడం ఉరిగిన వాక్షాన్ లోపలలో వృందాది గానామలు లేదు

6.7(8)

య) ఈస్మాదానం కు రాయనషా విధానం లేదు.

ష) అంగన విధానం సంప్రదాయ ఈస్మాదానం లేదు. చేయబడిన విధానం లేదు.

స) సమాధానం కు రాయనషా విధానం లేదు.
మానసచరయుం {రాళ్ 8(1)}

1. సిద్ధంచిన సంఖ్యలు, సమయం ప్రామాణికంగా ఉంటాయి

2. సిద్ధంచిన, మార్గాంధిక, రూపం, ఉత్తమంచనీయంగా ప్రామాణికంగా ఉంటాయి

3. మిత్రవంతంగా ప్రామాణికంగా ఉంటాయి

4. మార్గాంధిక రూపాన్ని విస్తృతంగా ఉంటాయి

5. మిత్రవంతంగా ఉంటాయి

6. ప్రయత్నం సాధనంగా ఉంటాయి
మాత్రమానం {విషయ 8(1)}

7. మయిలాక్స్, విలస మనమొడలు

8. మయిలాక్స్ మాత్రమం విధానం విస్తులు

9. నేసక్స్ సంస్థ, స్ట్ గఫ్ సంస్థ అంటే ఆమదే సంస్థ అత్యంత అకారనే విస్తులు

10. అత్యంత విస్తులు లను విస్తులు

11. సంస్థ మాత్రమం కాంస్ట్యూ అవస్థ

12. మాత్రమం సంస్థ మాత్రంం
3) సన్నితిలో ప్రపంచ రాత్రి సాంద్రత సరిపోగలు ఉండుంది బిగిన విషయం

రెండవ సంస్థ ఏడాది - 26, సంస్థ ఏడాది - 7

4) సాంస్కృతిక యుగానికి మార్గం కలయం చేశాడు సాధనాలు కారణం

ఎంచుకోడానికి మార్గం మార్గం చేశాడు ఉంచాడు విషయం కారణం

సాంప్రదాయానికి రెండవ సంస్థ కారణం నిర్మాణం మార్గంము 

చిత్రానికి మార్గం సాధనం మార్గంము.
சேர்வு முறையுடன் (செப்பு 24 வருடம்)

சேர்வு தலைக்குறியில் பிரபலமான நோய் அல்மெரியத்தின் குறிப்பிட்டு

1. குருத்திவிவேகம்
2. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர் சுவாமியை மறைவு

குருத்திவிவேகம் (2)

3. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர் வருடம்
4. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர் வருடம்
5. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
6. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
7. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
8. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
9. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
10. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
11. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
12. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
13. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
14. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
15. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
16. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
17. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
18. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
19. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
20. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
21. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
22. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
23. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
24. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
25. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
26. முனிவர் குமாரேஸ்வரர்
Central Information Commission, New Delhi

File No.CIC/SM/C/2012/000374
Right to Information Act 2005 Under Section (19)
Date of decision: 31 October 2012
Name of the Appellant: Shri C J Karira,
Plot No. 26, Road No. 1, Balamari Society, Mahendra Hills,
Secunderabad – 500 026.
Name of the Public Authority: CPIO, Central Bureau of Investigation,
Policy Division, 27, North Block, New Delhi.

7. The main issue to be decided in this case is whether an RTI application containing allegations of corruption should be entertained by the CPIO of the CBI under the proviso to Section 24 of the RTI Act or not. The proviso reads as follows: provided that the information pertaining to the allegations of corruption and human rights violations shall not be excluded under this subsection. The wording of the proviso is quite clear. It casts an obligation on the CPIO of the exempted organisation to entertain all requests for information pertaining to allegations of corruption or human rights violations. It does not make any distinction between the exempted organisations on the basis of the functions they perform nor between allegations of corruption on the basis of whether it is made against the employees of the exempt organisation or against others. It is true that the CBI is primarily responsible for investigating into all cases of corruption by public servants of the Central Government. Therefore, most of the information held by it would have a nexus with allegations of corruption. It is also true that the proviso to Section 24 of the RTI Act would make it necessary for the CPIO to entertain all such RTI applications, rendering the exclusion of the organisation from the operation of the Right to Information (RTI) Act almost pointless. This cannot be helped as the law is quite clear; this particular section does not exclude the exempt organisations from the ambit of the Right to Information (RTI) Act completely. It is a qualified exemption. It is possible that in some of the security and intelligence organisations, the information held, by and large, may not have much nexus with either allegations of corruption or with human rights violation. By its very nature, the CBI is different from those organisations in the sense that it primarily deals with cases involving allegations of corruption. To that extent, the benefit of the exemption available to other such organisations would not obviously be available to the CBI as most of the information held by it would be covered by the above proviso. Therefore, there is no escape from the fact that the CBI will have to consider all RTI requests for information which pertains to any allegations of corruption and human rights violation irrespective of the individual against whom such allegations are made. However, while the proviso casts a duty on the CPIO to entertain the RTI application seeking such information, all such information can be disclosed only subject to the provisions of the Right to Information (RTI) Act. In other words, if any such information is otherwise exempt under any of the exemption provisions, there is no obligation to disclose such information. All such requests would have to be dealt with on a case to case basis and appropriate order passed.

8. As far as the present RTI application goes, the information sought in it is clearly related to allegations of corruption against various public servants. Therefore, it is covered under the proviso to Section 24 of the RTI Act. The CPIO must, in this case, consider the RTI request and provide the information subject to the exemption provisions of the RTI Act within 15 working days of receiving this order. However, if he decides not to provide any information, he must to pass a speaking order citing the appropriate provisions of the RTI Act.
సమాచారాం అమలాను నియంత్రించడానికి వలన రాజయూనికి చాందిని ఇసుకడానికి ప్రతిసరిస్తూ చాందిని కాపీరెంచి ఉంచాలాంభన్ స్ట్యూన్ 9.

అతిశాయం అంటే మనకు సమాచారాం కారియరు అభూర్ణ్నాంపుర సమాచార అధికారికి త్రరసయించవచ్చు. మామలు ఇష్టం అంటే అంటే మామలు ఏడాది అనేవాడు నాథని ఇష్టం అంటే అంటే అవసాన అనేకమైన వస్తుంది.
మధ్యప్రదేశ్ రాష్ట్రం

మధ్యప్రదేశ్ రాష్ట్రం ఆంధ్ర ప్రదేశ్, తెలంగాణ, తమిళనాడు నుండి భారతదేశం చేరుతుంది. ఇది ఆంధ్ర ప్రదేశ్ దక్షిణ భాగం లోని మండలం. ఈ రాష్ట్రం ప్రస్తుతం ప్రముఖ రాష్ట్రాల పైగా ఉంది. మధ్యప్రదేశ్ రాష్ట్రం దక్షిణ భారతదేశంలో ప్రముఖ రాష్ట్రాలు కంటే పెద్ద కొరకు ఉంది.
సమాచార సంఘ మార్గ లోని మింహాయింపుల కింద దరఖాస్తురిన సమాచారం ఏ విధానానికి సాధించాలి.

1) సమాచార సంఘ మార్గ లోని మింహాయింపుల కింద సమాచారం అందించాలి.

2) మార్గానా విధానానికి రాని సమాచారానిని అందించాలి. 

3) మరు సమాచార పంపాలు సంఘాలు సమాచారానిని ప్రచారం చేయాలి.
REPORTABLE

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

Special Leave Petition (Civil) No. 27734 of 2012
(@ CC 14781/2012)

Girish Ramchandra Deshpande .. Petitioner

Versus

Cen. Information Commr. & Ors. .. Respondents

ORDER

1. Delay condoned.

2. We are, in this case, concerned with the question whether the Central Information Commissioner (for short ‘the CIC’) acting under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (for short ‘the RTI Act’)

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

Subject: Disclosure of personal information under the RTI Act, 2005.

The Central Information Commission in one of its decisions (copy enclosed) has held that information about the complaints made against an officer of the Government and any possible action the authorities might have taken on those complaints, qualifies as personal information within the meaning of provision of section 8 (1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005.

2. The Central Information Commission while deciding the said case has cited the decision of Supreme Court of India in the matter of Girish R. Deshpande vs. CIC and others (SLP (C) no. 27734/2012) in which it was held as under-

"The performance of an employee/Officer in an organisation is primarily a matter between the employee and the employer and normally those aspects are governed by the service rules which fall under the expression ‘personal information’, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest. On the other hand, the disclosure of which could cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of that individual." The Supreme Court further held that such information could be disclosed only if it would serve a larger public interest.

3. This may be brought to the notice of all concerned.

Encl: As above.

(Manoj Joshi)
Joint Secretary (AT&A)
Tel: 23093668

1. All the Ministries / Departments of the Government of India.
2. Union Public Service Commission /Lok Sabha Secretariat/ Rajya Sabha Secretariat/ Cabinet Secretariat/ Central Vigilance Commission/ President’s Secretariat/ Vice-President’s Secretariat/ Prime Minister’s Office/ Planning Commission/Election Commission.
4. Staff Selection Commission, CGO Complex, New Delhi.
5. O/o the Comptroller & Auditor General of India, 10, Bhudur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi.
6. All officers/Desks/Sections, DOP&T and Department of Pension & Pensioners Welfare.
Central Information Commission

Decision No.5315/IC(A)/2010
F. No.CIC/MA/A/2009/001027
Dated, the 16th April, 2010
Name of the Appellant: Shri. S.K. Dwivedi
Name of the Public Authority: Bhilai Steel Plant

Facts: i
1. Both the parties were heard on 16/4/2010.
2. The appellant has asked for a copy of the complaint on the basis of which disciplinary proceedings against the appellant were initiated and finally penal action was taken. In this backdrop, the appellant has asked for a copy of the complaint, which has been refused to him u/s 8(1)(g) of the Act. Being dissatisfied with the Appellate Authority’s order for denial of information, the appellant pleaded for providing a copy of the complaint filed by an agency.

Decision:
3. The appellant has asked for a copy of the complaint on the basis of which disciplinary action against the appellant has been taken. Now since the appellant has retired and that the complainant is an organization, it cannot be said that the disclosure of information would endanger the life and liberty of the complainant. The appellant is entitled to know the facts on the basis of which disciplinary action has been taken. In view of this, the denial of information u/s 8(1)(g) of the Act is unjustified.
4. The CPIO is directed to furnish a copy of the complainant, as asked for by the appellant, within 15 working days from the date of receipt of this decision.
5. The appeal is thus disposed of.
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Date of Decision: 28.4.2011
(i) LPA No. 744 of 2011
First Appellate Authority cum Additional Director General of Police and another .....Appellants
vs.
Chief Information Commission Haryana and another .....Respondents
(ii) LPA No. 745 of 2011
First Appellate Authority cum Additional Director General of Police and another .....Appellants
vs.
Chief Information Commission Haryana and another .....Respondents

CORAM: - HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT GUPTA
HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE A.N.JINDAL
Present: - Mr. Narender Hooda, Addl. AG, Haryana.
HEMANT GUPTA, J

Bribery: - An offer of money or favors to influence a public official.
Nepotism: Favoritism shown by public officials to relatives or close friends.
Fraud: Cheating the government through deceit.
Embezzlement: Stealing money or other government property.
Administrative Corruption: Corruption that alters the implementation of policies, such as getting a license even if you do not qualify for it.
Political Corruption: Corruption that influences the formulation of laws, regulations and policies such as revoking all licenses, and gaining the sole right to operate the beer or gas monopoly. The scope of expression administrative corruption includes arbitrariness in implementation of policies, grant of benefit to the officers in violation of the Rules. Therefore, the information in respect of the available vacancies and the manner in which such vacancies are filled up would be relevant to exclude the allegations of corruption.
సత్యానికి ఉపయోగించగానే నిర్ధిష్టంగా స్థాయిశాసనం {స.11}

1) ప్రమాణం అధికం 5 వేగం కంటే మార్గం రెండు ప్రయోగాలు యోగిస్తుంది. {స.11 (1)}

2) ఉత్తమ మార్గం రెండు ప్రయోగాలు మంచి చిత్రం ప్రదర్శించాలి {స.11(1)}

3) మనుష్యత్వ సమాధాన ఉప్యూషం వల్ల చిత్రం ప్రదర్శించాలి వాడక విశేషం {స.11 (2)}

4) పుస్తక విశేషం సూచించండి అంశానికి వాడక విదేశి ప్రదర్శించండి వాడక విశేషం మంచి చిత్రం ప్రదర్శించండి {స.11(3)}

వ్యతిరేక సమాధానం.
అప్పుడు వేడుకలు తయారు చేసి నాటికి నామకరణం
విడి నాలుగు శాస్త్రం.

- ఎక్కడ 3

ఇవి వాటికి విషయంగా నిషేధించడానికి ప్రపంచ ప్రస్తుతిలో విడిచే ప్రత్యేకమైన తరాణ
సంప్రదాయ విధానం అందించడానికి రెండు నామకరణ నిర్ధారించారు.

- ఎక్కడ 18
ప్రత్యేక ఈ ప్రశ్నలను వివరించి 20 సంవత్సరాలు ముందు అయిన, ఎంతవరకు ఇవి ఉండాం?

1) మంత్రికా ప్రశ్నలను వివరించి వినిపిడించండి?

2) వివిధ సంస్థల సమాచారం అవి ఉంటాయం?

3) భారత ఆలయాన్ని మార్గం అంటే భారత ఆలయాన్ని మార్గం అంటే?

4) అంతకు దక్షిణ భారత ఆలయం మార్గం అంటే, భారత ఆలయం మార్గం అంటే?

5) మరో మంత్రికా ప్రశ్నలను వివరించండి.
ప్రామాణిక దిగ్గజు

ప్రత్యేక పరిస్థితుల్లో సూచించబడిన సమయానికి విస్తరించండి

అ) ప్రధాన ఆదిపత్రి - విరోధం కలది చర్చించండి, విశేషంగా

సమయం అనుమతి.

ఇ) సాధారణ పత్రి. విరోధం పాటు విషయం రచించండి.

...... నంబరు 18(3)

వ) సమాధాన విధానాన్ని చేబడంటుంది. బాటలు శా 250/- ఇంకా

ప.సా.25,000/- నంబరు ఆధారాలను మిగిలి కలిగంతో... నంబరు 20(1)

స) సాధారణ పత్రి, పంచాయత్త నిర్ణయం కలిగంతో

వ) ప్రధాన పరిస్థితి వివరణ, విషయం మిగిలి నంబరు ఎక్కడ

చిన్నాను చేదించండి, సమయం అనుమతి కావడం పాటు చేయండి.
(3) కానూ పేరు శిష్యాడి పేరు కాశింది మిగిలిన మానవ్యూషం మాతృకలు మీ ఎమ్మెల్ శిత్రువు ప్రారంభించినది.

..... లిఫు 21.

(4)దిద్దల మహారాజు ప్రేమం 1923, ఒకపై చాల అందులు
ప్రేమం యొక్క ప్రేమం కదిగి తొలి రోజు మరింత అంతా సాధనా రోజు
ప్రేమం మరిన్ని అశ్రుతిభాగద్వారం.

..... లిఫు 22.

(5) కానూ ప్రత్యేకమైన జీవన యుగంలో అప్పుడు పంచము
ప్రత్యేక అనేవారు. (ఎన్ని ఎంత సంఖ్య)...

..... లిఫు 23.
A.P. INFORMATION COMMISSION
(Under Right to Information Act, 2005)
Ph: 040- 23230245 / 246, 23230592 (t).
Appeal No. 04/SIC-PVIB/2012, Date : 28.03.2013

Appellant/Complainant
Sri M. Raghunadh Reddy
CHALLUR Post
Venavganta Mandal
Karimnagar Dist.
Pin – 505 505

Respondents
1. The Public Information Officer (RTI Act)
O/o Joint Director of Agriculture
Dist Agriculture Office, Karimnagar
Karimnagar Dist.

2. The Appellate Authority
Joint Director of Agriculture
Dist Agriculture Office, Karimnagar
Karimnagar Dist.

ORDER

Sri M. Raghunadh Reddy, CHALLUR Post, Venavganta Mandal, Karimnagar Dist., has filed 2nd appeal dated 02.01.2012 which was received by this Commission on 4.01.2012 for not getting the information sought by him from the PIO to O/o Joint Director of Agriculture, Dist Agriculture Office, Karimnagar, Karimnagar Dist and 1st Appellate Authority to Joint Director of Agriculture, Dist Agriculture Office, Karimnagar, Karimnagar Dist.

The brief facts of the case as per the appeal and other records received along with it are that the appellant hearing filed an application dated 03.09.2011 before the PIO requesting to furnish the information under Sec. 6(1) of the RTI Act-2005.

Since the appellant did not receive the information from the Public Information Officer, he filed 1st Appeal dated 2-12-2011 before the 1st Appellate Authority requesting to furnish the information under Sec. 19 (1) of the RTI Act-2005.

The appellant stated that as he did not get information from the 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 the information sought by him and also to arrange to furnish the information sought by w/s of the RTI Act-2005.

The 2nd appeal was taken on file and Notices issued to both the parties for hearing on 25.03.2013.

Case called on 25-03-2013. The Appellant was present. The PIO/O/o Joint director of Agriculture, Karimnagar Dist was present.

The Commission directed to issue show cause notice to the then PIO for not furnishing the information in time and also to appear before the Commission on 28-10-2013.

Accordingly, Show Cause Notice is issued to then PIO as to why penalty of Rs. 25,000/- should not be imposed on him.

At the time of hearing held on 28-03-2013, the Commission observed from the submission of the PIO concerned that the Show cause notice issued by the Commission through Mr. Ishraiah, DDA, O/o. JD, Karimnagar to Mr. G. Jagan Mohan Reddy, (JDA Rektd) was refused by him, who was the then PIO was not present at the time of hearing.

Hence, the Commission directs to impose a penalty Rs. 25,000/- on the then PIO, Mr. G. Jagan Mohan Reddy and the said penalty amount must be credited to the following account recovering in five installments from his pension starting from May, 2013.

*0070 – Other Administrative service – 60 others service.
SH 25 - Receipt under RTI Act, 2005.*

P. Vijaya Babu,
State Information Commissioner

Authenticated by:
கிருஷ்ணராய
அம்புரின் மனித்யாரு.
அருள் உண்ணும் என மனித்யாரு.
அருள் மிதிரு கசம் மனித்யாரு.
வீமம் பாண்ட்ராயார் வா வா வாவா?
வீமம் நகரா வா வா பாண்டரா?
வீமம் மாருணா வா வா வாவா?
வீமம் மண்டிரா வா வா வாவா?
வீமம் குட்டார்காவா வா வா வாவா?

நாள் மேறு குரு மது மது குரு.
வா கொன்று ராகா மகோ,
வா கொன்று மகோ ராகா,
மேறு மாதங்க வா வா வாவா.

வா வா வா வா வா வா வாவா.
D. Emmanuel
RTI Activist

email: emmanuel.rti@gmail.com

PHONE NO. 9059990345