Bhilwara video gana

Continue











Bhilwara gana video. Bhilwada gana video. Bhilwara video. Bhilwara gana video mein.

LINKS TO OTHER RTI PAGES Decisions of Central Information Commission (CIC). RTI - Rules/Guidelines/Orders (Subject-Wise). RTI Rules/Orders (Subject-Wise). RTI - Court JudgementsMORE: Latest Department of Personnel & Training (DOPT)/DPPW Orders/CircularsSECTION-WISE DECISIONS 2022CIC Decision dated 04.08.2022 on the Second Appeal filed by Prakash Gopalan Vs. Public Information Officer, Office of CPMG, Kerala Circle, Deptt. of Posts, Thiruvananthapuram - The Commission directed the concerned PIO to furnish a revised reply to the Appellant, with regards to total period of working in the office as on 06.10.2021, as mentioned in instant RTI Application. In case relevant information pertained to some other department/branch, then PIO was also required to make sure that any third-party information or any other information which is exempted from disclosure under RTI Act, 2005, will not be disclosed to the appellant while providing the said reply. [Section 8(1)(i); Third Party Information] CIC Decision dated 01.08.2022 on the Second Appeal filed by Anil Kumr Agrawal Vs. CPIO, Canara Bank, Hapur - The public authority denied having received the RTI Application. However, the CPIO was advised to seek necessary assistance and communicate with the appellant in order to respond to the RTI application within the timelines prescribed under the RTI Act. CIC Decision dated 06.06.2022 on the Second Appeal filed by Dr. Rajiv Khatri Vs. CPIO, University Grants Commission, New Delhi - CIC: "..... the Commission is extremely irked to note that the onus of replying to the instant RTI Application is being shifted across different division of UGC. The Commission further notes that even after an efflux of 2 years of time, the Respondent public authority is yet to ascertain the actual custodian of the information. The Commission treats this as a blatant error and willful violation of the RTI Act and the said conduct of the Respondent Authority is highly admonished." [UGC, Grievance Redressal Mechanism in UGC]CIC Decision dated 25.05.2022 on the Second Appeal, Complaint filed by Prasoon Shekhar Vs. CPIO, Bar Council of India, New Delhi - CIC: "The FAA burst into frenzied arguments with the Appellant for bringing up allegations of lack of transparency and for insisting on non-compliance of earlier Commission's directions." xxxxxThe Commission directed the FAA to place this order before their competent authority to ensure that action is expedited with respect to the upgradation of the BCI website while also incorporating the stipulations of the PAA to place this order before their competent authority to ensure that action is expedited with respect to the upgradation of the BCI website while also incorporating the stipulations of the Commission in the H N Pathak case. The Commission also directed the CPIO to reiterate the opportunity of inspection of the available records to the Appellant and facilitate the same on a mutually decided date & time. [Conduct of FAA, Bar Council of India, Inspection of Colleges by BCI]CIC Decision dated 27.04.2022 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Hari Gupta Vs. CPIO, Office of DG of Income Tax, Lucknow - Directorate of Income Tax (Investigation) is an "Exempted Organization". CIC: "... no further disclosure in this respect is warranted in the matter in keeping with the provision of Section 24 of the RTI Act." [Sec 24; Tax Evasion Petition (TEP), Exempted Organisation] CIC becision dated 25.04.2022 on the Second Appeal filed by Savio J.F. Correia Vs. CPIO, Mormugao Port Trust, Goa - The CIC, inter alia, observed that "The Commission is thus unable to appreciate the square applicability of Section 8(1)(d) of the RTI Act to the specific information is not acceptable." The Commission, therefore, directed the CPIO to provide the available information under the categories mentioned in the RTI Act. [Secs. 8(1)(d) & (j), 19(5); Financial Investment by Statutory Body]CIC Decision dated 23.02.2022 on the Second Appeal/Complaint filed by Sh. Nagsen Rajaram Suralkar Vs. Department of Posts, Office of Supdt. of Post Office, Bhuswal, Maharashtra - The CIC, inter alia, observed that the CPIO has erred in providing the caste related information of all the employees in response to point no. 1 of RTI Application to the Appellant without seeking consent of said employees under Section 11 of RTI Act. In this regard, the CPIO was advised to follow due process of law as envisaged under the RTI Act. [Section 8(1)(j); Caste-Related Information which stands exempted from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j); Caste-Related Information of Employees] CIC Decision dated 22.02.2022 on the Second Appeal/Complaint filed by Sh. J.P. Tiwari Vs. CPIO, Department of Personnel & Training, New Delhi - The CIC decided that it (the facts of the case) reflected on the then CPIO's gross non-application of mind and a lackadaisical approach in executing the statutory duty cast upon him by virtue of the RTI Act. Nonetheless, the US & then CPIO was directed by the Commission to send his written explanation stating as to why no effort was invested by him in locating the averred complaint Matter, File Notings]CIC Order dated 03.01.2022 on the Second Appeal filed by Mr. Om Prakash Vijaivergia Vs. CPIO, State Bank of India, Siliguri, Darjeeling, West Bengal - The appellant attended the hearing through audio-call. Both the parties submitted their written submissions and the same were taken on record.CIC: "8. In view of the above, the Commission hereby issues strict warning to the concerned CPIO for not providing the available information for so long. That the conduct of the concerned CPIO is highly objectionable and same should be brought to the notice of his controlling authority for an appropriate view. He is being reprimanded for future as the information that could have been provided on time, also not provided by the concerned CPIO. That the conduct of the concerned FAA is also found to be lacking as the first appeal has not been disposed off meticulously, therefore the FAA's conduct should also be examined by its controlling authority.9. xxx xxx Further, the Commission observes that if the technical vendor is not cooperating with the CPIO, the controlling authority should take an appropriate view on competence performance of the vendor." [Conduct of the CPIO, National Mission for Manuscripts, New Delhi, and CPIOs of 4 other organisations - The CIC directed the NMM to put in public domain the around 3 lakhs manuscripts (according to the respondent) which it has digitized so far within a period of one year from the date of receipt of this order. The CIC also directed the NMM to allow the appellant official access (including downloading) of 30,000 manuscripts it has already put in public domain out of the total around 3 lakhs manuscript digitized so far. Further, the appellant was required to bear downloading cost which he had offered to bear 22.10.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Love Gogia Vs. CPIO, Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd., Office of CGM, Pune - The CIC has held that "Under the provisions of Section 19 (5) of the RTI Act, 2005, in an appeal proceeding, the onus to prove that a denial of a request was justified shall be on the CPIO. The CPIO in his reply had clearly failed to justify his position as to how the disclosure of information would be in contravention of the provisions enshrined under Section 8 of the RTI Act, 2005 and what commercial confidence would be breached as the information sought by the appellant is very general in nature." The CPIO was directed to re-visit the RTI application and provide a revised reply to the appellant and it was also directed that he should note that in case he is unable to justify the exemption so claimed, the sought for information should be provided to the appellant free of cost. [Sections 8(1)(d), 19(5); BSNL's ERP System]CIC Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav Das Vs. CPIO, Department of Health & Family Welfare - The CIC decided: "However, in view of the extraordinary predicament the world finds itself in, it is of vital importance that all relevant updates, notifications and information which are likely to serve larger public interest, and address concerns and worries should be widely disseminated to create awareness among the public. The Respondent must note that dissemination of vital information is as much a national duty as proper and effective discharge of their onerous responsibilities." [Sections 2(f), 6(3), 7(1), 8(1)(a), 19 and 25(5); Centralised Procurement of COVID-19 Vaccines for States, Foreign Aid, Larger Public interest, Life and Liberty Clause, Suo Motu Disclosure]CIC Decision dated 13.08.2021 on the Second Appeal/Complaint filed by Shri Shyamlal Yadav Vs. PIO, CPV Division, Ministry of External Affairs - As per the Decision of CIC, the RTI application was mechanically replied to by the erstwhile CPIO without application of mind. The Commission thus cautioned the erstwhile CPIO and Dy Passport Officer (Ops) to ensure that RTI application and provide the information. [Section 2(f); Passports, CPIO/PIO]CIC Decision dated 17.05.2021 on the Complaint filed by Shri Aniket Gaurav Vs. PIO, Ministry of Health & Family Welfare - CIC: "However, before concluding the decision at hand, the Commission wishes to advise the Respondent to ensure that maximum information of correct information. This will also obviate the need for filing of RTI cases by citizens on matters of such vital importance." [Sections 4, 18; Covid Vaccination Result Data]CIC Decision dated 23.03.2021 on the Second Appeal/Complaint filed by Shri Venkatesh Nayak Vs. CPIO, Department of Social Justice & Empowerment, New Delhi - The CIC observed that "The Commission observes at the outset that the denial of the information in the initial reply of the CPIO under Section 8(1)(i) of the RTI Act was grossly inappropriate as no justification was provided for invoking the said conduct of the CPIO is viewed adversely by the Commission as it is suggestive of his non-application of mind in dealing with the RTI Act." The CPIO was severely admonished for the inappropriate denial of the information to the Appellant and he is warned to ensure that due diligence is exercised while dealing with the RTI Applications in future. Regarding the prayer of the Appellant regarding the

```
suo motu disclosure of the Cabinet note pertaining to The Constitution (One Hundred and Third Amendment) Act, 2019 in light of the provisions of Section 4(1)(c) & 4(1)(d) of the RTI Act as well as Section 8(1)(i) of the RTI Act a copy of the order was marked to the Secretary, MoSJ, to look into the prayer of the Appellant. [Sections 4, 8(1)(i); Cabinet
Note, etc., Public Authority]CIC Decision dated 16.02.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Jitendra Kumar vs. CPIO, O/o Income Tax Officer, Aligarh, UP - The Central Information Commission directed the respondent to inform to the appellant the current status of his Tax Evasion Petition and/or if the said TEP has already been disposed of, then, broad
outcome of the Tax Evasion Petition should be informed to the appellant as per his RTI application, before transfer of the TEP to the Investigation wing. [Sections 8(1)(j); Tax Evasion Petition] Section 8(1)(j); Tax Evasion Petition Should be informed to the appellant as per his RTI application, before transfer of the TEP to the Investigation wing.
given by the public authority as to how and why the investigation or prosecution will get impaired or hampered by giving the information in question." [Exemption under Sec. 8(1)(h)] - Delhi HC Judgement dated 05.02.2021 - Amit Kumar Shrivastava Vs. Central Information Commission, New Delhi >>> RTI - Court JudgementsSection 8(1)(d)Delhi
High Court: "On the basis of the above judgments, the following principles can be clearly gleaned:i) CPIO/PIOs cannot function merely as "post offices" but instead are responsible to ensure that the information sought under the RTI Act is providedxxx
 Information cannot be refused without reasonable cause." [Section 5(3), 5(4), 5(5), 8(1)(d); PIO/CPIO] - Delhi HC Judgement dated 22.01.2021 - Har Kishan Vs. President Secretariat through its
Secretary & Anr. - Delhi High Court: Whenever information is sought under the RTI Act, disclosure of the applicant. Non-disclosure of the same could result in injustice to several other affected persons, whose information is sought. The petition was dismissed with
costs of Rs.25,000/- to be paid to the "High Court of Delhi (Middle Income Group) legal Aid Society". ..." [Sections 8(1)(j); Disclosure of an Interest in the Information, Candidatures' Particulars] - Delhi HC Judgment dated 12.01.2021 - Har Kishan Vs. President Secretariat through its Secretary & Anr.CIC Decision dated 28.12.2020 on the Second
Appeals filed by Deeksha Chaudhary Vs. CPIO, Air India Ltd., New Delhi - The CIC decided that it was necessary to ascertain the compliance of the FAA's order, it was thus deemed expedient that the 25 second appeals be
remanded to the FAA to ensure compliance of his/her earlier order dated 12.11.2018 in response to the Appellant's first appeals, in order to address the central issue agitated by the Appellant. [Section 7(9); Second Appeals Remanded to FAA]CIC Decision dated 21.12.2020 on the Second Appeals Remanded to FAA]CIC Decision dated 21.12.2020 on the Appellant.
CIC: "The Commission upholds the contention of the respondent that in the disclosure of the names of the donors and donees of electoral bonds from books of accounts may be in contravention of the provisions contained under section 8 (1) (e) and (j) of RTI Act. There appears to be no larger public interest overriding the right to privacy of the donors
and donees concerned." [Sections 8(1)(e) & (j); Donors & Donees of Electoral Bonds, Larger Public Interest]CIC Decision dated 06.11.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Rahmat Bano Vs. Office of Income Tax Officer, Aayakar Bhawan, Jodhpur, Rajasthan - CIC: "9. Taking into consideration the aforementioned analysis and the judgments of the
Higher Courts, the Commission directs the respondent to inform the appellant about the generic details of the net taxable income/gross income of her husband held and available with the Public Authority for the period 2017-2018 ....10. The details/copy of income tax returns and other personal information of third party need not to be disclosed to the
appellant except as mentioned at para no. 9 above." [Sections 8(1)(j), 19(3); Copy of Husband's ITRs]CIC Decision dated 05.11.2020 on the Complaint filed by Varun Krishna Vs. CPIO, Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Limited, Mumbai - CIC: "The CPIO cannot be expected to examine and make judgement to find out the name of the official and then
provide him report of the controlling authority, reasons for non-disposal including name, official mobile number and designation of their controlling authority, reasons for non-disposal including name, official mobile number and designation of their controlling authority, reasons for non-disposal including name, official mobile number and designation of their controlling authority.
20 of the RTI Act, 2005 is warranted in these cases." [Sections 18, 18(1)(e), 20; Penalty on CPIO pressed by the Complainant]CIC Decision dated 30.10.2020 on the Second Appeal/Complaint by Shri Kuldeep Kumar Baranwal v. CPIO, Prime Minister's Office, New Delhi - As per the CIC Decision, the queries of the Appellant were vague, hypothetical,
clarificatory and interpretative in nature which do not fall within the definition of information as per Section 2 (f)/(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. The Appellant was advised to strictly refrain in future from seeking information under the RTI Act, 2005. The Appellant was advised to strictly refrain in future from seeking information under the RTI Act, 2005.
information. [Section 2(f), 2(j), 8(1) (d), or (j); Improper Use of RTI Act]CIC Decision dated 16.09.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Mahendra Singh Vs. PIO/SDM (Narela), Naya Bans, Delhi through Shri Subhash Chandra Agrawal, Consultant of PIO -A significant aspect of this case is that it was remanded back to FAA by the CIC and that the
Respondent was represented by Shri Subhash Chandra Agrawal, consultant/representative of the PIO through audio conference. CIC: "Upon perusal of the Appellant is not satisfied with the information provided by the Respondent. It is further
observed that the Appellant has brought in certain aspects during the hearing which is outside the adjudicatory powers of the Commission. Hence, Commission deems it fit to remand the instant case back to Shri Tanvir Ahmed, FAA/ADM-North to provide a fair hearing to the relevant parties i.e., Appellant, Respondent and the BDO concerned and pass
a reasoned, speaking order by 31.12.2020..." [Agricultural Land]Delhi HC Judgment dated 31.08.2020 - Dr. R.S. Gupta Vs. Govt. of NCTD & Ors. - Delhi High Court: In absence of even a remote connection with any larger public interest, disclosure of information would be exempted as the same would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the
individual under section 8(1) (j) of the RTI Act. [Sections 7, 8(1)(j); Attendance Record] - Delhi HC Judgment dated 31.08.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Smt. Meeta Agrawal Vs. CPIO, DGM(G) & Nodal PIO, North Central Railway, RTI Cell, Subedarganj, Allahabad -In light
of the Delhi High Court Judgment dated 24.11.2014 [in the case of Naresh Trehan v. Rakesh Kumar Gupta (W.P(C) 85/2010)], and considering the facts of the case, the Commission observed that the grounds for the cancellation of the tender, the minutes and approval of the competent authority must be made available to a tender participant as non-
disclosure of the same would have affected the competitive as well as personal interest of the said participant. The Commission, therefore, directed the respondent to provide requisite information on point nos. 1, 3 and 4, after redacting information which related to commercial confidence or personal information of third parties, the disclosure of
which is exempted under Section 8(1) (d), or (j) of the RTI Act, to the appellant. [Section 8(1) (d), or (j); Minutes of the Competent Authority] CIC Decision dated 23.07.2020 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Saurav Das Vs. CPIOs, ICMR, and Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, New Delhi - CIC: " ... it is the considered
view of the Commission that authentic, verified and cogent reply based on factual information needs to be furnished to the Complainant as also disclose on the Public Authority website for the benefit of public at large. The fact that the application shuttled from one Division of the Public Authority to another indicates that there is a very urgent
requirement for not only notifying a Nodal Authority in the M/o H&FW to compile, collate and consolidate the information sought in the RTI application but to effectively act and suo motu upload the same on its website in compilance with Section-4 of the RTI Act, 2005. Therefore, the Commission advises the Secretary, Health & Family Welfare to
have this matter examined at an appropriate level and the Nodal Authority so notified should furnish all the details sought by the Complainant in a clear, cogent and precise manner within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of this order depending upon the condition for containment of the Corona Virus Pandemic in the Country or through
email." [Sections 4, 6(3), 8(1)(a); Coronavirus-related Information]CIC Decision dated 20.07.2020 on the Second Appeal/Complaint by Smt. Savitri Devi Vs. PIO, NDMC, Narela Zone, New Delhi - In order to ensure social distancing and prevent the spread of the pandemic, COVID-19, audio hearings (audio conferencing) were scheduled by the Hon'ble
Central Information Commission after giving prior notice to both the parties. The Commission observed that the PIO had made a mockery of the FAA's order by merely re-sending the initial PIO reply, which had not been received by the Appellant till the date of hearing. The Commission directed the PIO to furnish a comprehensive status report with
respect to the property under reference by the specified date failing which action would be initiated against the PIO as per the provisions of the RTI Act. [Immovable Property; PIO]CIC Decision dated 10.07.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Smt. Basavantamma Vs. CPIO, Office of the Income Tax Officer, Bengaluru - CIC: 14. ... "... this Commission
after considering the factual matrix of the case is of the opinion that in the absence of any larger public interest in the matter, the appellant is not entitled to seek the details of the Income Tax Returns filed by the third party, Mr. G H Sharanappa which is exempted u/Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. It is to be noted that the appellant has requested
this Commission for disclosure of at least the 'gross income' of Mr. G H Sharanappa so that she could defend her matrimonial case. Therefore, considering the aspect of marital discord between the husband and wife vis-à-vis her right of maintenance, this Commission is of the opinion that the respondent should consider providing only the limited
information of the last six years, i.e. the numerical figure(s) of the 'gross income' of her husband, Mr. G H Sharanappa ..." [Sections 8(1)(j), 19(3),20; Income Tax Return Details of Spouse]CIC Decision dated 24.06.2020 on the Second Appeal by Shri Baljeet Singh Vs. CPIO, Central University of Haryana, Mahendergarh (Haryana) - The CIC decided
that the CPIO erred in stating that no information was asked, whereas the information sought was specific and it is relevant to mention that right to inspect also. The CIC directed the CPIO to provide a revised reply to the application includes right to inspect also. The CIC directed the CPIO to provide a revised reply to the applicant had sought as
copy of the Minutes of Meetings of the Committee constituted for considering promotions, held from 01 January 2018 to 30 April 2019, for considering promotion/selection of non-teaching staff (posts). [Section 8(1)(j); Minutes of DPC/Committee] CIC Decision dated 22.06.2020 on the Second Appeal by Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. CPIO, Office of Customs,
Central Excise & Service Tax Settlement Commission, Mumbai/Kolkata/New Delhi/Chennai - The CIC, in view of the facts and upon hearing the parties at great length to obtain accessible 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. Therefore, denial of accessible information is the CD/DVD format under the RTI Act, 2005 could not be upheld by the CIC. [Sections 2(j)(iv), 4(2), Rule 15 of the Customs and Excise Settlement Commission Procedure 2007; Copies
of orders passed by the Settlement Commission, no. of orders passed, etc.]. CIC Decision dated 05.06.2020 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Venkatesh Nayak Vs. CPIO, Directorate General of Health Services, Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, New Delhi - The Complainant vide his RTI application sought information on 05 points regarding the district
wise number of hospitals and healthcare facilities called by any other name, designated as COVID-19 treatment centers as on date; postal addresses and telephone numbers of the hospitals and healthcare facilities and other issues related thereto. The complainant, Mr. Venkatesh Nayak, attended the hearing through WhatsApp.From the Respondent's
side, the hearing was attended by Dr. Sandeep Sharma, CPIO (SJH), Mr. Mahesh Mangla, CAPIO, SJH, Dr. R. Laxmi Narayan, ADG, ICMR, Dr. Ashok Kr. Singh, Prof. Chest Med. LHMC, Dr. Ashok Kr. Singh, Pro
through WhatsApp/TC. Expressing its displeasure at the state of affairs, the CIC advised the secretary, M/o H&FW to designate an officer of an appropriate seniority as a Nodal Officer to examine the matter and suo motu disclose the information sought in the RTI application on the website of the Public Authority within a period of 15 days from the
date of receipt of this order in the larger public interest. [Section 4(1); Distt.-Wise No. of Hospitals for Covid Treatment] CIC Order dated 03.06.2020 on the Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - The Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mum
The Commission after adverting to the facts and circumstances of the case, hearing the respondent and perusal of records, feels that it is necessary for both parties to be present for proper adjudication of the issues raised in the matter. Accordingly, the appeal is adjourned." [Sections 8(1)(a)&(d), 11(1),20(1); Appeal from Public Authority]CIC
Decision dated 01.05.2020 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Anil Sood Vs. CPIO & Nodal Officer of Central Govt. Health Scheme. R.K. Puram Sector 12, New Delhi-22 - The complaint filed by Mr. Anil Sood Vs. CPIO & Nodal Officer of Central Govt. Health Scheme
R.K. Puram Sector 12, New Delhi-22, observed on May 01, 2020 that there was complete negligence and laxity in the public authority (CGHS) in dealing with the RTI applications. It is abundantly clear that such matters are being ignored and set aside without application of mind which reflected disrespect towards the RTI Act, 2005 itself. The
Commission expressed its displeasure on the casual and callous approach adopted by the respondent (CGHS) in respondent was against the spirit of the RTI application. It was felt that the conduct of Respondent was against the spirit of the RTI application. It was felt that the conduct of Respondent was against the spirit of the RTI application. It was felt that the conduct of Respondent was against the spirit of the RTI application. It was felt that the conduct of Respondent was against the spirit of the RTI application. It was felt that the conduct of Respondent was against the spirit of the RTI application. It was felt that the conduct of Respondent was against the spirit of the RTI application. It was felt that the conduct of Respondent was against the spirit of the RTI application.
CGHS, Supply of Medicines to WCs]CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO, Steel Authority of India, Dhanbad [Sections 19(3), 20; CPIO (Warning to CPIO)]CIC Decision dated 23.04.2020 on the Complaint filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO, Steel Authority of India, Dhanbad [Sections 19(3), 20; CPIO (Warning to CPIO)]CIC Decision dated 23.04.2020 on the Complaint filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO, Steel Authority of India, Dhanbad [Sections 19(3), 20; CPIO (Warning to CPIO)]CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the Complaint filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO, Steel Authority of India, Dhanbad [Sections 19(3), 20; CPIO (Warning to CPIO)]CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the Complaint filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO (Warning to CPIO)]CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the Complaint filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO (Warning to CPIO)]CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the Complaint filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO (Warning to CPIO)]CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the Complaint filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO (Warning to CPIO)]CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the Complaint filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO (Warning to CPIO)]CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the Complaint filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO (Warning to CPIO)]CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the CPIO)]CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on t
Delhi [Section 20(1); ATR, File Notings, CPIO, University of Delhi, decided on April 22, 2020, as under:-(i)
the RTI Act to the Secretary DoPT to evolve a system after coordinating with the Director General, NIC in the RTI Act. (ii)

A report on the action taken on the advisory might be sent to the Commission by the Secretary, DoPT within 7
days from the date of withdrawal of lockdown. Due to the ongoing pandemic of coronavirus in the country and the prevalent lock down, the Commission found it appropriate to highlight the issue of Sec 7(1) implementation by citizens more so, when postal receipt of RTI applications are minimal, in such situations all public authorities should
encourage RTI applications through e-mail in case of life and liberty matter.(iii) A unique e-mail id can be created by the CPIOs in this regard. In so far as other normal RTIs are concerned, the RTI portal can be used. The
Deputy Registrar was directed to circulate this order widely to the public authorities related to the Registry, [Sections 4(1)(b), 7(1), 19(1), 25(5); Sports Quota, Delhi University, Public Authority, Minutes of Meeting]CIC Decision dated 19.03.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Ajay Manda Vs. CPIO, Ch. Charan Singh National Institute of Agriculture
Marketing, Jaipur - CIC: "Therefore, without commenting on the merits of the rival contentions made by the parties, the Commission deems it appropriate to dismiss this appeal, as voluminous information was sought for which replies have been provided and any further requirement for disclosure would disproportionately divert the resources of the
public authority. The appellant is advised to be responsible and avoid filing repeated RTI applications seeking voluminous information." - [Section 7(9); Habitual RTI Applicant] CIC Decision dated 17.03.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Mr. D.T. Eshwaran Vs. CPIO, Central Govt. Employees Welfare Housing Organization, New Delhi - The
Commission expressed extreme displeasure at the conduct of the CPIO in flouting the FAA's order. Hence, the concerned CPIO was issued a strict warning to be careful in future with regard to the observations, made in the Decision. The present CPIO was issued a strict warning to be careful in future with regard to the observations, made in the Decision.
of lapse is repeated in future, the Commission decided that it would be constrained to initiate penal action against him under the relevant provisions of the RTI Act. The Hon'ble Commission that the CPIO should note that at
this stage he cannot transfer the RTI application, however, he could obtain information from its custodian after seeking assistance u/s 5(4) of the RTI Act. It was further ordered that the onus was now on him to obtain the required information and provide it to the appellant as per the timeline specified in the Decision. [Sections 5(4), 20; CPIO]
Construction Work]Certified Copies of Court DocumentsSC: "42. ...... In the absence of inherent inconsistency between the provisions of the RTI Act and other law, overriding effect of RTI Act would not apply.(ii) The information to be accessed/certified copies on the judicial side to be obtained through the mechanism provided under the High Court
Rules, the provisions of the RTI Act shall not be resorted to." - (Secs. 2, 4(b), 6(2), 8(1)(a) to (j), 19, 22, 31; Disclosure of Information; Certified Copies of Court Documents)- SC Judgment dated 21.02.2020 on the
Second Appeal by Mr. Amit Khera v. CPIO, Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited, Delhi. Keeping in view the facts of the case and the submissions made by both the parties and in the light of the decisions cited in the Decision, the Commission instructed the Respondent (HPCL) to disclose the broad outcome of the investigation redacting
information exempted under Section 8 (1) of the RTI Act, 2005 to the Appellant as also suo moto disclose the same on their website. - [Sections 2(f), 2(j), 8(1)(d); Investigation Report]CIC Decision dated 10.02.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Ajay Kumar v. CPIO, Northern Central Railway, Agra. CIC: "7. Further, this Commission observes that the
reply dated 21-03-2018 on point no. 2 is evasive in nature wherein the then CPIO did not apply his mind while replying to the RTI application and therefore, the CPIO is hereby issued a warning for future to be careful and not to contravene the provisions of the RTI Act, 2005.* [Sections 19(3), 20; Warning to CPIO, Recruitment]CIC Decision dated
06.02.2020 on the Second Appeal by Mr. Rana Ranjan v. CPIO, National Insurance Company Ltd., Bhavnagar, Gujarat - [Sections 2(f), 8(1)(j); Leave Record]CIC Decision dated 20.12.2019 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Kripalani M. v. CPIO, Office of Pr. Commissioner of Customs, Menezies Aviation Cargo Terminal, Bangaluru (Full Bench Decision)
[Sections 8(1)(j), 20; Posting, Property Ownership]Delhi High Court judgment dated 17.12.2019 - Electronic Voting Machine]CIC Decision dated 06.12.2019 on the Complaint filed by Neeraj
Sharma v. CPIO, National Payments Corporation of India, New Delhi (Full Bench Decision). NCPI not a public authority. CIC: "Not declared as public authority NPCI might not be under an obligation to disclose the information requested for by the complainant nor maintain a list of CPIOs as mandated by the RTI Act. Commission is also of the view that
it may be open to the complainant to seek information through public authority for NPCI i.e. RBI or Ministry of Finance as the case may be." - [Sections 2(h); NPCI]CIC Decision dated 05.12.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - According to the CIC, it appeared that the respondent was taking
the RTI application as well as the Commission very casually which is detrimental to the very purpose of the RTI Act. The Commission directed the Registry of that Bench to issue show cause notice to the CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Department of Banking Supervision, Central Office, Mumbai, for explaining as to why action under Section 20(1) of the
RTI Act should not be initiated against him. [Sections 8(1)(d), 11(1) & 20(1); Report of Bank]CIC Decision dated 27.11.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Ehtesham Qutubuddin Siddiqui v. CPIO, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi (Full Bench Decision) - [Sections 8(1)(j), 8(3); UPSC Forms]CIC Decision dated 27.11.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Ehtesham Qutubuddin Siddiqui v. CPIO, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi (Full Bench Decision) - [Sections 8(1)(j), 8(3); UPSC Forms]CIC Decision dated 27.11.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Ehtesham Qutubuddin Siddiqui v. CPIO, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi (Full Bench Decision) - [Sections 8(1)(j), 8(3); UPSC Forms]CIC Decision dated 27.11.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Ehtesham Qutubuddin Siddiqui v. CPIO, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi (Full Bench Decision) - [Sections 8(1)(j), 8(3); UPSC Forms]CIC Decision dated 27.11.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Ehtesham Qutubuddin Siddiqui v. CPIO, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi (Full Bench Decision) - [Sections 8(1)(j), 8(3); UPSC Forms]CIC Decision dated 27.11.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Ehtesham Qutubuddin Siddiqui v. CPIO, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi (Full Bench Decision) - [Sections 8(1)(j), 8(3); UPSC Forms]CIC Decision dated 27.11.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Ehtesham Qutubuddin Siddiqui v. CPIO, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi (Full Bench Decision) - [Sections 8(1)(j), 8(3); UPSC Forms]CIC Decision dated 27.11.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Ehtesham Qutubuddin Siddiqui v. CPIO, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi (Full Bench Decision) - [Sections 8(1)(j), 8(3); UPSC Forms]CIC Decision dated 27.11.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Ehtesham Qutubuddin Siddiqui v. CPIO, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi (Full Bench Decision) - [Sections 8(1)(j), 8(3); UPSC Forms]CIC Decision dated 27.11.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Ehtesham Qutubuddin Siddiqui v. CPIO, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi (Full Bench Decision) - [Sections 8(1)(j), 8(3); UPSC Forms]CIC Decision
by Shiv Kumar Kanoi Vs. CPIO, Central Bank of India, Regional Office, Mumbai -CIC: The respondent is cautioned that responding or providing documents in other RTI applications."" [Balance Sheet, Profit & Loss Statement, GST/Service Tax]CIC
Decision dated 27.11.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Anand Nallan Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai -CIC: "Moreover, the appellant being absent and not having filed any written objections, the averments of the respondent are taken on record. There appears to be no public interest in further prolonging the matter." [Applicant, Credit
Card, KYC, Voice Recordings, Fraudulent SMS]CIC Decision dated 07.11.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Rakesh Sharma Vs. Asstt. Secretary & CPIO, Central Board of Secondary Education, Regional Office, Allahabad - The Central Information Commission directed the respondent to provide the information, after severing that part of information
which would result in disclosure of reasons/purpose of leave which is a third party personal information and hence, is exempted from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j), 10(1); Medical Reimbursement; Purpose of Leave]Madras HC Judgment dated 16.10.2019 - The Tamil Nadu Dr. Ambedkar Law University,
Chennai Vs. The Tamil Nadu State Information Commission, Chennai - Madras HC: ".... the other procedures or regulations formulated by any other institutions can never override the purpose and object of the Right to Information Act, 2005.
xxx xxx "Thus, the second respondent is entitled to receive the answer scripts as sought for in his application under the Right to Information Act, 2005. All such similar applications are also to be disposed of by the writ petitioner-Law University, as expeditiously as possible." - [Section 22; Answer Scripts/Sheets]Delhi HC Judgment dated 10.10.2019
Govt. of NCT of Delhi & Anr Vs. Krishan Kumar - Delhi HC: "A mere reading of Sections 18, 19 and 20 of the RTI Act, 2005 clearly shows that the CIC cannot give directions to handover the possession of the RTI Act, 2005 clearly shows that the CIC as stated under the RTI
Act, 2005." [Sections 18,19 & 20; Giving judgments on organisation's policy not envisaged] CIC Decision dated 09.09.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Vipin Jain v. CPIO, UCO Bank, Indore - The Commission was of the view that the reply given by the respondent is incomplete and evasive when allegations of corruption or irregularities have been
made and that the public interest demanded that the information should be made available to the appellant. In view of the above, the respondent was directed to provide the complete action taken and findings of the officers with respect to allegations made by the appellant in his complaint dated 12.06.2018. [Sections 8(1)(d) and (j)] Public Interest,
Action Taken Report]CIC Decision dated 01.08.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Nikhil Kumar Singh v. CPIOs, Central Board of Secondary Education - CIC: "These Appeals and Complaints reveal that the appellant in the garb of seeking information is flooding the public authority with similar RTI applications. x x x Therefore, without commenting
on the merits of the rival contentions made by the parties, the Commission deems it appropriate to dismiss these appeals and complaints. Note: The cases listed from serial no. 12 to 21 are being disposed of collectively on the same day, without issuing notice of hearing, being frivolous and repetitive in nature. x x x In the context of the aforesaid
observations, the Commission does not find it expedient to afford any further opportunity of hearing in the above listed cases from serial no. 12 to 21 as well as similar cases of the appellant which may be pending with the Commission." [Improper Use of RTI Act)CIC Decision dated 29.07.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Ms. Renu Garg v. CPIOs
 "Although, the strength of material on record does not warrant ascribing a mala fide intention on the part of the then CPIO for having denied the information but the allegation of the Complainant that this kind of conduct amounts to stonewalling RTI Applications and stifling the very letter and spirit of RTI Act weighs in. By resorting to such
 unwarranted opacity, DoPT is setting a bad example for other public authorities and at the same time is discrediting its own footing as the nodal agency for implementation of RTI Act. Commission admonishes the then CPIO for invoking Section 8(1)(i) of the RTI Act without assessing its applicability and the present CPIO is also warned against
mindlessly endorsing the reply of the then CPIO." [Section 8(1)(i); CPIO, Appointment of CIC]CIC Decision dated 28.06.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Mandeep V. CPIO, Bureau of Immigration, New Delhi, CPIO, IB, New D
CPIO, MHA within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order under intimation to the appellant. The Commission further directed the CPIO, MHA, New Delhi, to provide correct and complete information to the appellant within a period of four weeks. [Sections 6(3), 24(1); Bureau of Immigration]CIC Decision dated 12.06.2019
public officials concerned, to the appellant within a period of four weeks... ... [Article 74(2) of the RTI Act; Mercy Petition]CIC Decision dated 22.05.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Ms. Nutan Thankur vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - CIC: "The disclosure of the entire files may also reveal the names of
"This forum is not a grievance redressal forum. Moreover, the Commission is not satisfied with the arguments of the appellant that an inquiry under section 18 of the RTI Act is required in this matter. The Commission feels that ends of justice would be met if the appeal is dismissed." [Sections 18, 19(8)(b), 20(1)]CIC Decision dated 29.04.2019 on the
Appeal filed by Shri Manoj Kumar v. CPIO, Central Bureau of Investigation, Anti-Corruption Branch, Patna - CIC: "Even further, Commission summarily rejects the contention of the CPIO that he is required to provide information only on those allegations of corruption that pertains to their own employees, as RTI Act nowhere provides for any
such exception. Similarly, Section 24 of the RTI Act does not provide for any further exemption and/or human rights violation. In view of the foregoing, Commission directs the CPIO to provide available and specific information sought in the RTI
Application in a point-wise manner to the Appellant ... ... Further, Commission finds that the incorrect connotation ascribed by the CPIO to the provisions of RTI Act that it is only applicable to cases involving CBI's own employees may result in gross violation of the provisions of RTI Act by the Respondent office in future." [Section 24(1);
Corruption, Appointment]CIC Decision dated 26.04.2019 on the Complaint filed by Monish Gulati v. CPIO, Ministry of Civil Aviation, New Delhi - CIC: "Commission drops the show-cause proceedings initiated in the matter with severe reprimand to the CPIO and he is directed to exercise utmost care in future to ensure that reply on RTI Applications is
 Application was returned by the CPIO on 16.06.2017 on the ground that the "Pay to" column in the Indian Postal Order has been left blank. Commission deems this as a deliberate attempt of the CPIO at obstructing the Appellant had filled an
incorrect IPO, he had merely left the column blank perhaps to avert a situation where his IPO is returned on the grounds of being incorrectly filled. Commission severely admonishes the CPIO on both the above counts and warns him to remain extremely careful in future." [Sections 4(1)(b), 8(1)(d) & (j); Payment of Fees; Salary of Employees]CIC
Decision dated 26.03.2019 on the Appeal filed by Nutan Thakur v. CPIO, Department of Personnel & Training, New Delhi - CIC: "In view of the foregoing, Commission directs Sanjay Kumar, US & CPIO to provide the list of names of IAS officers for whom prosecution sanction has been granted as well as denied for the period starting from year 2010
till date of RTI Application." [Sections 7(9), 8(1)(j); Prosecution, Name of IAS Officers for whom prosecution has been granted/denied] CIC Decision dated 11.03.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Ashok Rameshbhai Mistry v. CPIO, Dena Bank, Surat - CIC: "The Commission agrees that the remaining information including the names and account
number of the NPA burrowers may not be furnished as the same are exempted under sub-section (1) (e) of section 8 of the RTI Act. In view of the appellant to controvert the contentions of the respondent, the respondent may be accepted. Accordingly, the appeal is
dismissed." [Section 8(1)(e); NPA, Name & Account Number of NPA Borrower]CIC Decision dated 07.03.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Vipin Yadav v. PIO, Office of the Land Acquisition Collector (South-West), GNCTD - CIC: The case was remanded by the Hon'ble CIC to the current FAA/ADM for ensuring compliance of the FAA's order dated
23.01.2017. The FAA was desired to call for explanation from the aforementioned PIOs for causing deliberate obstruction in the flow of information and non-compliance of the Enquiry Report being submitted before the Commission. Further, the PIO was directed by the CIC to
provide complete information, in response to the queries of the appellant, as already directed by the FAA vide order dated 23.01.2017, after submission of documents establishing title to the property, by the appellant. Compliance report was required to be submitted by the current PIO/SO,LAC within three weeks of receipt of this order, failing which
appropriate action, as per law, would be initiated by CIC. [FAA, NOC for Land]IC Decision dated 15.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri R.P. Rohilla v. PIO, Dte. General of Health Services, New Delhi - CIC: "Section 11 of the RTI Act does not cast an obligation on the PIO to resort to third party procedure in all cases. Section 11 comes into play only
when the PIO proposes to disclose information which is personal and exempted under Section 8(1)(j) in absence of any element of larger public interest. Even before the Commission, no case of public interest has been established. Accordingly, the Commission
finds the decision of PIO as well as FAA to be in line with law laid on the aspect. (See: Girish Ramchandra Deshpande vs. C.S. Shyam and Ors. (31.08.2017 - SC): MANU/SC/1068/2017)" [Sections 8(1)(j) & 11; Address of Applicant, Larger Public Interest] CIC
Decision dated 13.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Ms Pushpa Devi v. CPIO, Central Coalfield Limited, Jharkhand - The CIC has obverted that the legal heir of a deceased is entitled to receive information pertaining to the deceased person. [Section 20(1); Service Record]CIC Decision dated 12.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v.
CPIO Election Commission of India, New Delhi - CIC: ""Thus, the EVM which is available with the respondent in a material form and also as samples, as admitted by the respondent, the software installed in the EVM is an intellectual
the appellant within four weeks ... [Sections 2(f), 2(i), 6(1), 8(1)(d), 20; Electronic Voting Machine (EVM)]Delhi HC Judgment dated 16.01.2019 - Ehtisham Qutubuddin Siddique v. CPIO Intelligence Bureau - Delhi High Court: "... ... The only import of second proviso to Section 24(1) is that information relating to corruption and human rights violation
would fall within the scope of the RTI Act. Section 8 of the RTI Act. Section 8 of the RTI Act provides for certain exemptions from disclosure of information and the said provisions would be equally applicable to information and the said provisions would be equally applicable to information and the said provisions would be equally applicable to information and the said provisions would be equally applicable to information and the said provisions would be equally applicable to information and the said provisions would be equally applicable to information and the said provisions would be equally applicable to information and the said provisions would be equally applicable to information and the said provisions would be equally applicable to information and the said provisions would be equally applicable to information and the said provisions would be equally applicable to information and the said provisions would be equally applicable to information and the said provisions would be equally applicable to information and the said provisions would be equally applicable to information and the said provisions would be equally applicable to information and the said provisions would be equally applicable to information and the said provisions would be equally applicable to information and the said provisions would be equally applicable to information and the said provisions would be equally applicable to information and the said provisions would be equally applicable to information and the said provisions would be equally applicable to information and the said provision and the said provision and the said provision are said to the said provision and the said provision and the said provision and the said provision and the said provision are said provision and the said provision and the said provision are said provi
1993; Copy of IB Report] CIC Decision dated 15.01.2019 on the Appeal filed by Mr. Kantilal B. Chavda v. CPIO, Central University of Gujarat, Gandhinagar, Gujarat - CIC: "Keeping in view the facts of the Respondent Public Authority to
suo motu disclose the information as narrated in the preceding paragraphs in the public domain in accordance with the provisions of Section 4 of the RTI mechanism for seeking such information as outlined in the aforesaid Court judgements.
[Sections 4, 8(1)(g); Purchase, Supplier/Vendor, Recruitment, Tender, University]CIC Decision dated 10.01.2019 on the CVC Act, 2003; however, the guidelines
 issued by CVC as discussed above does stipulate a time frame to all public authorities and these guidelines do not anywhere suggest indemnity to CVC itself from adhering to those timelines.xxx xxx A copy of this order is marked to the Secretary, Central Vigilance Commission to look into the aspect of inordinate delay in completing
enquiry/investigation by CVC and take correctiveaction as deemed fit." [Complaint, Inquiry, CVC]CIC Decision dated 24.12.2018 - Mr. R.S. Rai v. CPIO, Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan, Jabalpur - CIC: "The Appellant could not substantiate his claims regarding mala fide denial of information by the Respondent or for withholding it without any
reasonable cause." [Sections 2(f), 20; Leave Record, Result Analysis]CIC Decision dated 21.12.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sounder Rajan v. CPIO, IDBI Bank Limited, Mumbai - CIC: The Commission, however, notes that the Notice for Hearing served upon the appellant was returned undelivered to the Commission with the remark "Deceased". In
view of the death of the appellant and the Commission's Circular F. No.2/Management regulation2007/CIC-MR dated 18.06.2018, the Commission directs the respondent to publish the information sought vide point nos. 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 of the RTI application, as per the available records, suo-motu on their website ....." [Sec. 2(f), 4, 20; FD Account]CIC
Decision dated 19.12.2018 - Nirmal Singh Dhiman v. CPIO, Deptt. of Ex-Servicemen, New Delhi - CIC: "In the event, the averred letters and corresponding noting(s) remain untraceable, Commission directs the CPIO to file an appropriate affidavit to this effect stating the efforts made in tracing out the information and the factum of non-receipt of
letters and unavailability of file noting(s). The said affidavit should be sent to the Commission with its copy duly endorsed to the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant." [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant. [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant. [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appellant. [Section 2(f); File Notings]CIC Decision dated 08.11.201
for hockey matches being put in public domain [Sections 6(3), 7(6), 8(1)(d), (e) & (j), 8(2); File Notings, Complimentary Passes, Hockey India League]CIC Decision dated 02.11.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT - CIC issued show-cause notice to RBI governor for non-disclosure of wilful defaulters' list [Sections 2(f) and the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT - CIC issued show-cause notice to RBI governor for non-disclosure of wilful defaulters' list [Sections 2(f) and the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT - CIC issued show-cause notice to RBI governor for non-disclosure of wilful defaulters' list [Sections 2(f) and the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT - CIC issued show-cause notice to RBI governor for non-disclosure of wilful defaulters' list [Sections 2(f) and the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT - CIC issued show-cause notice to RBI governor for non-disclosure of wilful defaulters' list [Sections 2(f) and the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT - CIC issued show-cause notice to RBI governor for non-disclosure of wilful defaulters' list [Sections 2(f) and the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT - CIC issued show-cause notice to RBI governor for non-disclosure of wilful defaulters' list [Sections 2(f) and the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT - CIC issued show and the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT - CIC issued show and the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT - CIC issued show and the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT - CIC issued show and the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT - CIC issued show and the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT - CIC issued show and the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT - CIC issued show and the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT - CIC issued show and the
 4(1)(b),(c),(d), 8(1)(a),(d),(e) & (h), 8(2), 19(8), 22; NPA]CIC Decision dated 05.09.2018 on the Appeal filed by R.P. Verma Vs. CPIO, Ordnance Factory, Raipur, Dehradun - CIC: The CPIO was directed to place this order before their competent authority to pass a speaking order ..... Appellant was warned against the misuse of RTI Act in future and was
advised to make judicious use of his right to information or the documents sought for, is primarily responsible under: "... ... the CPIO being custodian of the information and in case of default or dereliction on his part, the penal
action is to be invoked against him only. The Appellate Authority is not the custodian of the information or the document. It is only a statutory authority to take a decision on an appeal with regard the tenability or otherwise of the action of the CPIO and, therefore, there is a conscious omission in making the Appellate Authority liable for a penal action
under Section 20 of the RTI Act and if that be the scheme of the Act and the legislative intention, we see no error in the order passed by the learned writ Court warranting reconsideration." [Sections 19(1), 20 of the RTI Act] - Delhi HC Judgment dated 29.08.2018 - R.K. Jain Vs. Union of IndiaCIC Decision dated 06.08.2018 on the Appeal filed by Mr.
K.S. Jain Vs. CPIO, Dte. Gen. of Vig., Customs & Central Excise, New Delhi - The Appellant was not able to contest the submissions of the Respondent or to establish the larger public interest in disclosure which outweighs the harm to the protected interests. The Commission observed that the said matter pertained to exemption claimed u/s 8 (1) (h)
and not Section 8 (1) (j). The Commission also observed that the applicant therein sought information in the context of his own suspension pending disciplinary action, whereas in the present instance, the Appellant had sought information regarding a third party. [Sections 8(1)(h), 8(1)(j); Public Interest, 3rd Party]CIC Decision dated 06.08.2018 on the
Appeal filed by Ms. Rashi Agrawal Vs. CPIO, SPMCIL, New Delhi, CPIO, Indian Security Press, Nashik - CIC: "... ... it is evident that the transfer of RTI application u/s 6 (3) to the concerned PIO was not made by the Respondent (ISP
Nashik) subsequent to the transfer of points 03 and 05 of the RTI application by FAA, SPMCIL, vide letter dated 06.09.2016 which was a grave violation of the provisions of the RTI application by FAA, SPMCIL, to depute an officer of a senior rank to seek the explanation to the show cause notice from the
concerned CPIOs and furnish the details sought by the Complainant ....." [Sections 6(3), 20(1); Processing of RTI Application/1st Appeal]CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Subhash Chandra Agrawal Vs. CPIO, Min. of Environment, Forest & Climate Change, New Delhi - The CIC was of the opinion that a token amount of
Rs.1,000/- should be paid as compensation to the appellant u/s 19(8)(b) of the RTI Act for the detriment caused him for the delay
caused. [Sections 2(f), 19, 19(8)(b); File Notings, Compensations to Complainant]CIC Decision dated 11.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri S.P. Sinha Vs APIO, Min. of Shipping, MMD, Mumbai - The Hon'ble Commission directed the concerned CPIO to disclose the sought for information after obtaining consent of the third parties. Regarding Point
No.5 of the RTI application, the respondent CPIO was directed to fix a joint inspection of relevant records on a mutually convenient time and place and thereafter to provide certified copies of records as selected by the appellant free of charge u/s 7(6) of the RTI Act. [Sections 7(6), 8(1)(j), 11(1) of the RTI Act; DPC; Filed to the RTI Act. [Sections 7(6), 8(1)(j), 11(1) of the RTI Act. [Sections
Notings, Third Party Information]CIC Decision dated 04.07.2018 on the Appeal, Complaint filed by Shri Hans Raj Chug Vs. PIO, Delhi Development Authority, New Delhi – As per the CIC decision, the Commission, inter alia, found that the objection of third party(ies) was not legally tenable considering that information sought was not personal in
nature. Thus the reply of the PIO and the FAA were set aside. It has been further observed by the Hon'ble Commission that the FAA had skipped the analysis of the queries vis-a-vis the responses, though he is supposed to exercise his expertise based on domain knowledge. Hence, the Commission remanded this case back to the FAA for complete and
proper adjudication of the issues and ensuring that information, invoking [Section 5(4) of the RTI Act; First Appellant upon obtaining the same from the relevant custodians of information, invoking [Section 5(4) of the RTI Act; First Appellant upon obtaining the same from the relevant custodians of information, invoking [Section 5(4) of the RTI Act; First Appellant upon obtaining the same from the relevant custodians of information, invoking [Section 5(4) of the RTI Act; First Appellant upon obtaining the same from the relevant custodians of information and information in the same from the relevant custodians of information and information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of information in the same from the relevant custodians of informatio
Ministry of Health & Family Welfare - The CIC observed as under:-"The society is a creation of MCI, housed in the MCI building for extending ease of functioning. In garb of functioning to have abrogated its right to access information from the society.""The process of bestowing national honours cannot be said to have abrogated its right to access information from the society.""The process of bestowing national honours cannot be said to have abrogated its right to access information from the society."
be kept away from public scrutiny. Any practice facilitating opacity will go on to diminish the sanctity of the honour and its past recipients." The CPIO, MCI was accordingly directed to access information from Secretary, Dr. B.C. Roy National Award Fund and furnish the same to the appellant. [Dr. B.C. Roy National Award]CIC Decision dated
25.06.2018 on the Appeal filed by Balkrishna Porwal Vs. PIO, Department of Posts - As per the CIC Decision, by denying the information the appellant was not only harassed by the public authority, but also by the CPIO, and that while public authority denied them
under RTI Act besides wrongfully invoking Section 8(1) (d) and (g). For the reasons stated in its decision, Hon'ble Commission concluded that denial of information to the appellant was without any reasonable cause, and hence liable for maximum penalty of Rs. 25,000 under section 20 of RTI Act, Hon'ble Commission also found it as a fit case to
recommend the public authority to initiate disciplinary action against the CPIO in view of the analysis, in the above-referred decision. [Section 16 of SHW Act of 2013; Inquiry Report; Sexual Harassment; File Notings]CIC Decision dated 25.06.2018 on the Appeal filed by Ajay Kumar Vs. CPIO, Indian Oil Corporation Ltd.
Lucknow - The CIC observed that the 1st appellate authority order dated 13-06-2017 was not proper, wherein, the 1st appellate authority was without application of mind. The 1st
appellate authority was advised to adhere to the PTI Act/Rules while disposing of 1st appeal(s). The Deputy Registrar was directed to send complete RTI application file to the CPIO for taking necessary action. [First Appealate Authority (FAA)]CIC Decision dated 18.06.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Neeraj Sharma Vs. CPIO, Rajya
Sabha Sectt., New Delhi - The CIC was of the view that the delay of more than 5 days in transferring the application had been duly explained by the respondent and the appellant was provided a reply well within the stipulated period of time. The Commission did not find any reasons to impose penalty on the CPIO. [Sec. 6(3);
CPIO)]CIC Decision dated 31.05.2018 on the Appeal filed by Hitender Vs. CPIO, Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi - The Commission was of the opinion that the complainant (who was an Australian citizen with the OCI card) could not be treated as Indian citizen for the purpose of seeking information u/Section 3 of the RTI Act. Moreover, the RT
Act, 2005 does not have any provisions for furnishing information to overseas citizen of India. It is applicable to Indian citizen(s) only. [Overseas Citizen of India] CIC Decision dated 11.07.2017 on the complaint filed by Shri Saurabh Bindal Vs. Delhi Lawn Tennis Association(uploaded on CIC website on 19.04.2018) - The issue before the bench of the
Central Information Commission was to decide whether Delhi Lawn Tennis Association is a public authority per section 2(h) of RTI Act, 2008. In the light of the reasons stated in the Order and it was open to the parties
to agitate the matter before the Commission again after the superior courts have pronounced their decision. [Section 2(h); Delhi Lawn Tennis Association is or is not a Public Authority under the RTI Act]CIC Decision dated 07.05.2018 on the Appeal, Complaint filed by Mr. M. Dinesh Vs. PIO, Bureau of Immigration, IB (MHA) - It was, inter alia,
observed by Hon'ble Information Commissioner that he was left with no doubt that a man preparing for his self defense in penal proceeding exercises his basic human right. Any impediment in the same would invariably be a breach of human right. The term 'violation' as preceding the term 'human right' in proviso to Section 24 of the RTI Act had to
be understood in a broader manner so as to cover any past or ongoing violation of human rights. The appellant was seeking information about his own travel details to prove his innocence in a criminal proceeding. The information about his own travel details to prove his innocence in a criminal proceeding. The information about his own travel details to prove his innocence in a criminal proceeding. The information sought was crucial to the appellant for a fair opportunity of self defence. The Hon'ble Commission was not considering the
sought. Accordingly, the Commission directed the PIO, Bureau of Immigration, Intelligence Bureau/MHA to provide complete information sought within four weeks of receipt of the order. [Sections 8 & 24; Human Rights; Self Defence]CIC Decision dated 19.04.2018 on the Appeal filed by Ashok Pandit Vs. CPIO, State Bank of India, Maheshkhunt,
Khagaria, Bihar - CIC: "The copy of Land Possession Certificate (LPC) and land receipts of the borrowers is personal information of the borrowers, which is held by the Bank in a fiduciary capacity, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public interest and would cause an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of
the third parties. Hence, the disclosure of the information sought is exempted under Section 8(1) (e) and (j); Land Possession Certificate]CIC upholds PMO's decision not to disclose Aadhaar details of PM [Section 8(1)(e) and (j); Land Possession Certificate]CIC upholds PMO's decision not to disclose Aadhaar details of PM [Section 8(1)(e) and (j); Land Possession Certificate]CIC upholds PMO's decision not to disclose Aadhaar details of PM [Section 8(1)(e) and (j); Land Possession Certificate]CIC upholds PMO's decision not to disclose Aadhaar details of PM [Section 8(1)(e) and (j); Land Possession Certificate]CIC upholds PMO's decision not to disclose Aadhaar details of PM [Section 8(1)(e) and (j); Land Possession Certificate]CIC upholds PMO's decision not to disclose Aadhaar details of PM [Section 8(1)(e) and (j); Land Possession Certificate]CIC upholds PMO's decision not to disclose Aadhaar details of PM [Section 8(1)(e) and (j); Land Possession Certificate]CIC upholds PMO's decision not to disclose Aadhaar details of PM [Section 8(1)(e) and (j); Land Possession Certificate]CIC upholds PMO's decision not to disclose Aadhaar details of PM [Section 8(1)(e) and (j); Land Possession Certificate]CIC upholds PMO's decision not to disclose Aadhaar details not disclose Aadhaar det
8(1)(j); Personal Information] - CIC Decision dated 19.02.2018 on Appeal filed by Soni S. Eramath Vs. CPIO, Prime Minister's Office, New DelhiSC: "Weighing the need for transparency and accountability on the one hand and requirement of optimum use of fiscal resources and confidentiality of sensitive information on the other, we are of the view
that information sought with regard to marks in Civil Services Exam cannot be directed to be furnished mechanically. Situation of exams of other academic bodies may stand on different footing. Furnishing raw marks will cause problems as pleaded by the UPSC as quoted above which will not be in public interest." (Emphasis Added.) (Sections 8,9,11)
- SC Judgement dated 20.02.2018 - Union Public Service Commission, etc. Vs. Angesh Kumar & Ors. Etc. >>> RTI-Court JudgementsDelhi HC: "Section 8 provide for blanket exemption that entitles the respondent to withhold all notings
on a file.", " .... the reasoning, that the notings or information generated by an employee during the course of his employment is his information and thus has to be treated as relating to a third party, is flawed." [Sections 2(f),8(1)(e),11(1),19(3); File Notings, Third Party Information] - Delhi HC Judgement dated 12.02.2018 - Paras Nath Singh Vs.
Union of India >>> RTI-Court JudgementsCIC Decision dated 22.01.2018 on the Second Appeal, Complaint filed by Shri Rajender Saxena Vs. PIO,EE, Citi Zone, North Delhi Municipal Corporation - CIC: "Perusal of the records of the recor
incomplete and unsatisfactory. The case is remanded back to the FAA to adjudicate over the matter and decide the same on merits, giving specific directions to the PIO to furnish the deficient information, if any." [FAA, CPIO]CIC Decision dated 18.01.2018 on the Complaint filed by A. Gopi Krishna Vs. CPIO, Syndicate Bank, Regional Office,
Visakhapatnam - CIC: "The Commission, therefore, directs the FAA, Syndicate Bank, Regional Office, Visakhapatnam, to inquire into the matter as to whether the RTI application was received in the branch and, if so, what action was received in the branch and, if so, what action was taken on the RTI application. The FAA shall also, if required, take appropriate departmental action was received in the branch and, if so, what action was received in the branch and, if so, what action was received in the branch and, if so, what action was received in the branch and, if so, what action was received in the branch and, if so, what action was received in the branch and, if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, whether the branch and if so, whether the branch and if so, whether the branch and if so, what action was received in the branch and if so, whether the branch and if so, whether the branch and if so, whether the branch an
                                 lacement of the RTI application. A copy of the inquiry
                                                                                                         report along with the action taken report may be provided to the Commission as well as to the appellant within a period of six weeks. ..." [FAA, CPIO, Departmental Action for Misplacement of RTI Application]CIC Decision dated 05.12.2017 on Appeal filed by Madhu Vs. PIO
& Sr. DMM, DRM Office, Northern Railway, New Delhi - The CIC directed the CPIO (Personnel) to issue notice u/s 11 of the RTI Act to the third party within five days from the receipt of the order, informing him of the Commission's order and of the fact that the respondent was directed to disclose the information subject to third party's consent and
invite the third party to make a submission in writing on whether the information sought for in the above-stated RTI application should be disclosed to the appellant in this case. [Sections 2(n), 8(1)(j), 11(1); Caste Certificate]CIC Decision dated 05.12.2017 on the Appeal filed by Om Prakash Sharma Vs. PIO, Department of Posts - CIC: "... CPIO is
directed to explain why the Public Authority should not be directed to pay compensation to the appellant for providing illegible documents." [Leave Record, MACP, CPIO's action amounting to denial of information, Compensation to Appellant for providing illegible documents."
Technology, Patna - CIC: The Commission directed the CPIO to provide to the appellant only the total amount of LTC claimed by the Director, NIT as per available record, excluding the name of family members, while providing information the CPIO would adhere to the provisions of the RTI Act, 2005. [Sections 10(1); LTC]CIC Decision dated
20.11.2017 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Shailesh Gandhi Vs. The CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Central Office Building, Mumbai (Full Bench Decision) - Paras 29 and 30 of CIC's Decision: "29. ... ... the instant Complaint is not maintainable under Section 18(1)(f) of the RTI Act due to the absence of cause of action. Moreover, the Complainant could
not substantiate the reasons for not filing an RTi application with the Public Authority before filing a Complaint with the Commission. 30. The Complaints filed by Shri R.K. Jain and Ms. Ita Bose against Indian Banks Association,
Mumbai - CIC: The Indian Banks Association is declared as a public authority under Section 2(h) of RTI Act 2005. [Sections 2(h), 18, 19(8)(a)(ii)]CIC Decision dated 20.10.2017 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Ramraj Sonkar Vs. CPIO, Branch Manager, SBI, Kanpur Nagar - CIC: The respondent was directed to show cause in writing that why action
should not be taken against him for not attending the hearing in the Commission, within 30 days. (CPIO)CIC Decision dated 17.10.2017 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Yogesh Chandra Vs. CPIO, Office of SE (Elect.). BSNL, New Delhi - The respondent denied the information relating to paras 3 and 4 (tenders awarded from September, 2011 to
March, 2012; and photocopy of tender scrutiny notes) of this RTI application on technical ground saying that 'award' of tender was not issued from their office. The respondent to collect the information from the section/office where it is available.
and provide to the appellant. (CPIO)CIC Decision dated 16.10.2017 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Y.N. Prasad Vs. Ahlmad Evening Court - CIC: "Judicial proceedings and records thereof are public records and the appellant has a right to secure desired information. After hearing the appellant and perusal of record, the Commission deems it fit to
direct the respondent PIO to offer inspection of the judicial file to the appellant on a mutual convenient day and time. The appellant shall be entitled to avail copies from the record upon payment of usual charges." [Judicial Proceedings/Records]CIC Decision dated 16.09.2017 on the Second Appeal/Complaint filed by Shri Shailesh Gandhi, Shri
Madhukar Ganpat Kukde and Shri Nimish S. Agarwal Vs. CDR Cell, IDBI Tower, Mumbai (Full Bench Decision) - CDR is not a public authority under the RTI Act. [Section 2(h)] CIC Decision dated 14.09.2017 on the Appeal filed by Shri R.B. Patil Vs. PIO, Department of Posts - The CIC on May 29, 2017, inter alia, ordered that "It is wrong to collect
huge amount after delaying the response by two months. As per law they cannot charge if they have delayed the response beyond one month. Hence the Commission directs the response by two months. As per law they cannot charge if they have delayed the response by two months. As per law they cannot charge if they have delayed the response beyond one month. Hence the Commission directs the response by two months.
dated 04.09.2017 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Ashwani Kumar Avasthi Vs. The CPIO, SBI, Mumbai & Director/GM, IBPS, Mumbai (Full Bench Decision) - Institute of Banking Personnel Selection (IBPS) is not a public authority under the RTI Act. SC
Judgment dated 31.08.2017 - Canara Bank Rep. by its Deputy Gen. Manager Vs. C.S. Shyam & Anr.CIC Decision dated 08.08.2017 on the Appeal file by Sh. RK Jain, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, High Court of Madras, Madurai Bench of Madras High Court of Ma
Courts/Tribunals can help the general public, litigants and all other stake holders in linking the Hon'ble High Court's orders/judgments with the impugned orders and thereby serve a larger public interest." [Sections (4)(1)(b), 22; Suo Motu Disclosure] CIC Decision dated 28.07.2017 on the Appeal filed by Ms. Krishna Sharma vs. PIO, Department of
Posts, Supdt. of Post Offices, Gwalior - CIC: "The Commission recommends Shri Ananta Narayan Nanda, Secretary, Department of Posts & Chairperson, Postal Services Board to either instruct CPIOs to attend second appeal hearings or replace them with officers of different rank with requisite aptitude so that they responsibly represent the case
during hearing." [Section 20 of RTI Act; Second Appeal, Third Party Information, Action Taken, Pension] CIC Decision dated 28.07.2017 on the Appeal filed by Munna Ahmad vs. PIO, Dargah Committee, Ajmer - CIC: "As a journalist, appellant has every right to criticize the functioning of public authority. As a citizen he can also file RTI application.
But he has no right to demand Advertisements for his magazine building pressure of RTI applications." [Improper Use/Misuse of RTI]CIC Decision dated 16.06.2017 on the Second Appeal filed by Nammi Bano Vs. National Commission for Women - The explanation of the First Appellate Authority has been sought as to why disciplinary action should not
be recommended against him for violating law in dealing with first appeal under RTI Act, in spite of being accused of sexual harassment of the complainant, which could be a clear case of conflict of interest. The Member Secretary has been directed to explain why the NCW should not be ordered to pay compensation to the appellant for the
harassment. In exercising the powers under section 18 (1) of RTI Act, the respondent authority has been directed to conduct inquiry into the appellant's complaints, and to provide the report to the Commission. [Sections 7(9), 8(i)(j), 18(1), 19(3)&(6), 20, Sexual Harassment Act, 2013; FAA, Compensation to RTI Applicant]CIC Decision dated
07.06.2017 on the Appeal filed by Mohd. Amin, J&K Vs. CPIO, TCIL, New Delhi - CIC: "6. The Commission observed that the respondent should be informed of the factual position of the processing and payment of his bills. The relevant documents, note sheets etc. may be provided to him. ... ... The respondent is directed to provide information to the
appellant as stated in para 6 above, free of cost ..." [Payment of Bills] CIC Decision dated 18.05.2017 on the Complaint filed by Shri Subhash Chandra Agrawal, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai - CIC: "5 ... ... In any case, a public authority should not return an RTI application merely on the ground that it is not addressed to a
specific CPIO but only to 'CPIO'. 6. In the light of the foregoing, we direct the Respondent public authority to appoint a nodal CPIO and give wide publicity to his name, designation and address. It will be the task of this nodal CPIO to discharge the responsibilities contained in the directions of
the High Court of Delhi mentioned in paragraph 4 above." [Nodel CPIO]CIC Decision dated 06.04.2017 on the Second Appeal filed by Mrs. Gunmala Jain, Lalitpur, UP Vs. CPIO, Sr. Supdt., Jhansi, UP - The appellant had filed RTI application dated 08.06.2015 seeking information regarding the PPF account of her husband Sh. Jay Kumar Jain viz.
passbook of his PPF account; details of amount from opening date to 07.10.2013; copy of account opening form SB-3 and other related issues. CIC, inter alia, decided that "The respondent should be carried out in the presence of
appellant or her authorised representative. Further, the appellant shall be allowed to inspect the record on mutually agreed date and time ......" [Inspection of Records, PPF Account, Post Office] CIC Decision dated 05.04.2017 on the Second Appeal filed by Sucheta Sureshkumar Vs. PIO, EPFO, Mumbai - CIC: "... ... it is not proper on part of Mr. Raju
Kumar to reject RTI application on the ground that name of the addressee for IPO was not correct. Besides rejecting the PIO spent around Rs. 10/- to Govt. of India when he purchased the IPO. Both common sense and prudence does not
justify spending Rs. 100/- asking for Rs. 10/-. If PIO had furnished information and along with that had he asked for properly addressed IPO, there could have been justification for spending Rs. 10/-. If PIO had furnished information and along with that had he asked for properly addressed IPO, there could have been justification for spending Rs. 100/-. The Commission records its admonition against the CPIO for such rejection and warns the public authority not to reject RTI applications in this manner.
The Commission finds Mr. Raju Kumar accountable for wasting more than Rs. 100/- for rejecting the RTI application." [Section 6(1), Rule 3 of RTI Rules, 2012; Payment of Fee, PF Dues, IPO]CIC Decision dated 30.03.2017 on Second Appeal filed by Amrika Bai V. PIO, EPFO, Raipur - CIC: "The Commission also requires as per Section 19(8)(a)(i, iii &
iv) of RTI Act, the public authority to consider pension related information as life and liberty concerned information and circulate amongst all CPIOs, and train them to provide such information concerning pension within 48 hours and the
FAAs to initiate hearing proceedings within 48 hours." [Sections 7(1), 19(8)(a)(I,iii & iv), Art. 21 of Constitution, Section 125 of CrPC; Pension, Right to Life, Sr. Citizen)CIC Decision dated 08.03.2017 on the Appeal filed by Insad, New Delhi, Vs. Dy. P.O., Min. of External Affairs, R.K. Puram, New Delhi - CIC directed Chief Passport Officer to lay down
clearly articulated policy, shared with general public, for re-verification of police report. [Sections 19, 20; Passport]CIC Decision dated 09.02.2017 on Appeal filed by Shri Shrigopal Soni Vs. PIO, National Science Centre -CIC: "If the complaint by an admonished misuse leads to punishment, RTI will become a mockery, encouraging removed employees
like this complainant to further misuse RTI and demoralize the disciplinary Case, Suspension, Misuse of RTI, Action Against Complainant." [Disciplinary Case, Suspension, Misuse of RTI, Action Against Complainant to further misuse RTI and demoralize the disciplinary Case, Suspension, Misuse of RTI, Action Against Complainant to further misuse RTI and demoralize the disciplinary Case, Suspension, Misuse of RTI, Action Against Complainant (Institute Complainant) (Institute Case, Suspension) (Institute Case,
Council of Science Museum - CIC: "The Commission directs the public authority to provide certified copies of contract copy, records of bills payable to outsourced employees and to update information about service records of bills payable to outsourced employees and to update information about service records of bills payable to outsourced employees and to update information about service records of bills payable to outsourced employees and to update information about service records of bills payable to outsourced employees and to update information about service records of bills payable to outsourced employees and to update information about service records of bills payable to outsourced employees and to update information about service records of bills payable to outsourced employees and to update information about service records of bills payable to outsourced employees and to update information about service records of bills payable to outsourced employees and to update information about service records of bills payable to outsourced employees and to update information about service records of bills payable to outsourced employees and to update information about service records of bills payable to outsourced employees and to update information about service records of bills payable to outsourced employees and to update information about service records of bills payable to outsourced employees and to update information about service records of bills payable to outsourced employees and to update information about service records of bills payable to outsourced employees and to update information about service records of bills payable to outsourced employees and to update information about service records of bills payable to outsourced employees and to update information about service records of bills payable to outsourced employees and to update information about service records of bills payable to outsourced employees and to update information about service records of bills payable to outsourced employees and 
Outsourced Employees]CIC Decision dated 20.01.2017 on Appeal filed by Mr. Ashwani Kumar Gupta, Distt. Durg, Chhattisgarh Vs. CPIO, Office of the RTI Act, the same cannot be denied to the information seeker except on any of the grounds
mentioned in Section 8 or 9 of the RTI Act, the CPIO cannot add or introduce new reasons or grounds for rejecting furnishing of information." [Sections 2(f), 8 and 9; Conciliation Proceedings] CIC Decision dated 13.01.2017 on Appeal filed by Shri Shanker Goel, New Delhi - CIC: "However, the Commission directs the CPIO to provide copy of file note
to the appellant, wherein the proposal was initiated/approved, in case it pertained to the appellant, after following the provisions of Section 10(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, ..." [Section 8(1)(j), 10(1); Pay/Pension]CIC Decision dated 04.01.2017 on the Appeal filed by Shri Devraj, Distt. Dharwad, Karnataka vs. CPIO, South Western Railway, Bangalore - CIC:
 "Copy of the appointment letter of the third party employee can be given to the appellant. Rest of the information; Appointment letter]CIC Decision dated 04.01.2017 on the Appeal filed by Mr. Ankur Jindal, Delhi, vs. CPIO, West
Central Railway, Kota, Rajasthan - The CIC observed that the defense taken by the respondent under Section 8(1)(a) of the RTI Act was vaque, as no case of impact on national security etc. had been made out. It was, inter alia, ordered that "The Commission is of the view that the information should be provided to the appellant on his application
dated 10.03.2015, as this is not barred under RTI Act." [Section 8(1)(a)]CIC Decision dated 29.12.2016 on the Appeal filed by Shri Pradeep B. Sharma, Indore vs. State Bank of India, Jabalpur/Bhopal - The Central Information held that the information held that the information sought could not be provided to the appellant under the provisions of Section 8(1)(e) and (j) of the
RTI Act, 2005 and that moreover, the appellant had not substantiated any larger public interest for divulging such information." [Section 8(1)(e)&(j)]CIC Decision dated 27.12.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Harinder Dhingra Vs. PIO, Ministry of Environment & Forests, New Delhi -CIC: "The Commission remands the first two questions of the RTI
application back to the CPIO of PMO with a direction to initiate fresh efforts to find out the historical facts about them in larger public interest, as that is a national necessity to address
the patriotic and secular sentiments of the people of India. ... ..." [Section 6(3); National Anthem/National Song, etc.]CIC Decision dated 05.12.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Prashant Katela Vs. CPIO, Railway Board, New Delhi - The CIC, in its order, directed the Railway Board to take steps to amend the rules regarding copying charges suitably to
bring them in conformity with the letter and spirit of the RTI Act and Rules. [Photocopying Charges, Direction to Public Authority] CIC Decision dated 17.11.2016 on Appeal filed by Mrs. Gayatri Devi, Distt. Patna, Bihar Vs. CPIO, Office of GM, Personnel Branch, Vaishali, Bihar - [Section 8(1)(j); Inspection of Files] CIC Decision dated 16.11.2016 on
Appeal filed by Mr. Hukma Raj Badala, Pali, Rajasthan Vs. CPIO, North Western Railway Division Office, Ajmer - CIC: The Commission advises the appellant to give a complete list of information, within 7 days of the order for which the reply was yet to be given to him in the context of his RTI request. The appellant was admonished for using improper
language and making allegations that were not supplemented by him during hearing. [Recruitment]CIC Decision dated 15.11.2016 on Appeal filed by Mr. Narayan Prasad, Bikaner, Rajasthan Vs. CPIO, DRM Office, Bikaner, Rajasthan -CIC: "The respondent is advised to conduct an inquiry into why a decision was taken that the Railway Club is an
autonomous body and is not within the purview of the RTI Act. The name of the person (s) taking this decision may also be given. "CIC Decision dated 01.11.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Y.K. Mall Vs. PIO, KVS, New Delhi - CIC: "The appellant as on today has a right to information about remarks in the ACR and to know the reasons for average/adverses."
remarks. The RTI Act does not provide any answer to such questions, for which a policy need to be formulated. The affected employees like appellant need to organize representation and the appropriate Government should consider the same. The Commission recommends both." [ACRs]CIC Decision dated 01.09.2016 on Appeal filed by A.B.S.J. Rao
(ESM), Kakinada District, AP Vs. CPIO, NCC Group Hq., Kakinad District, A.P. - CIC: "Commission takes very strong exception of non attendance of CPIO during the hearing of Second Appeal. He has also not provided any reply to the Appellant. A show Cause notice should be issued to the CPIO to send his written submissions explaining as to why
penalty should not be imposed on him for both lapses as per Section 20(1) of the RTI Act." [Sections 7(9) & 20(1)]CIC Decision dated 31.08.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Joginder Singh, Tihar, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Si
```

```
established before the Commission. "His personal grievance concerning his conviction cannot become the ground of larger public interest", observed the Commission. Therefore, the Commission upheld the decision of the RTI Act. [Section 8(1)(j); Disciplinary
Action]CIC Decision dated 16.08.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Tolendra Kumar Baghmar, Chhattisgarh Vs. CPIO, Dena Bank, Raipur - The CIC noted that the Respondents holds the information concerning the accounts of their customers in a fiduciary capacity and it is exempted from disclosure under Section 8 (1) (e) of the RTI Act, in the absence of
a finding of larger public interest. The Appellant had not established any larger public interest for disclosure of the information sought by him. His unsubstantiated allegation regarding an unauthorised withdrawal from the account by the outgoing sarpanch could not become the ground of larger public interest. The decision of the Respondents was
upheld. [Sections 8, 8(1)(e), 11 and 19; Public Interest, Third Party Information] CIC Decision dated 16.08.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sham Sundar, Faridkot, Punjab Vs. CPIOs at Mumbai and Chandigarh, NABARD[Sections 8 (1)(e)] CIC Decision dated 22.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sham Sundar, Faridkot, Punjab Vs. CPIOs at Mumbai and Chandigarh, NABARD[Sections 8 (1)(e)] CIC Decision dated 22.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sham Sundar, Faridkot, Punjab Vs. CPIOs at Mumbai and Chandigarh, NABARD[Sections 8 (1)(e)] CIC Decision dated 22.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sham Sundar, Faridkot, Punjab Vs. CPIOs at Mumbai and Chandigarh, NABARD[Sections 8 (1)(e)] CIC Decision dated 22.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sham Sundar, Faridkot, Punjab Vs. CPIOs at Mumbai and Chandigarh, NABARD[Sections 8 (1)(e)] CIC Decision dated 22.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sham Sundar, Faridkot, Punjab Vs. CPIOs at Mumbai and Chandigarh, NABARD[Sections 8 (1)(e)] CIC Decision dated 22.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sham Sundar, Faridkot, Punjab Vs. CPIOs at Mumbai and Chandigarh, NABARD[Sections 8 (1)(e)] CIC Decision dated 22.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sham Sundar, Faridkot, Punjab Vs. CPIOs at Mumbai and Chandigarh, NABARD[Sections 8 (1)(e)] CIC Decision dated 22.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sham Sundar, Punjab Vs. CPIOs at Mumbai and Chandigarh, NABARD[Sections 8 (1)(e)] CIC Decision dated 22.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sham Sundar, Punjab Vs. CPIOs at Mumbai and Chandigarh, NABARD[Sections 8 (1)(e)] CIC Decision dated 22.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sham Sundar, Punjab Vs. CPIOs at Mumbai and Chandigarh, NABARD[Sections 8 (1)(e)] CIC Decision dated 22.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sham Sundar, Punjab Vs. CPIOs at Mumbai and Chandigarh, NABARD[Sections 8 (1)(e)] CIC Decision dated 22.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sham Sundar, Punjab Vs. CPIOs at Mumbai and Chandigarh, Punjab Vs. C
Lucknow [Sections 4(1)(a) & 8(1)(j); RTE Act, JJ Act; Art. 21,21A & 39(e) of the Constitution of India; Inquiry Report, School]To see detailed news, click here.CIC Decision dated 21.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gulab Singh Rana, GM, Indian Overseas Bank, Chennai - CIC: "The decision of IOB to deny the
information to accused/appellant is illegal, unconstitutional and in serious violation of appellant's internationally recognized human rights besides the RTI Act. The investigating agency, CBI, performing police functions, was a contributor of investigative inputs, while the IOB as sanctioning authority has complete decision making power. It is
established that Section 24 was illegally invoked ignoring its proviso." The IOB was directed by the CIC to provide the point-wise information sought by the RTI Act, Sections 5, 162 r/w 123 & 165 of the Indian Evidence Act, Articles 19(1)(a) & 21 of the
Constitution of India; CBI Investigation, Prosecution]CIC Decision dated 11.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Vivek Duggal Vs. CPIO, Petroleum and Natural Gas Regulatory Board, N. Delhi (Div. Bench Decision) - CIC: The Commission upheld the decision of the Respondents to deny the information sought at point 2 (ii) (a) to (h) of the RTI application
 [Sections 8, 8(1)(d) & 11(1)]CIC Decision dated 28.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Nanik Premchand Rajwani, Distt. Thane Vs CPIO, Union Bank of India, Mumbai (Division Bench Decision) - CIC: The CPIO of the Respondent Bank was directed to provide to the Appellant the information in response to point (a) of his RTI application. With regard to
 the information sought at points (c) to (e) of the RTI application, the Commission saw no ground to question the submission of the Respondents that they do not maintain compiled information regarding action taken against their officers / statutory auditors in respect of the specific misdemeanours mentioned at the above points. Therefore, the
Commission did not interfere with the CPIO's response to these points. [Sections 8(1)(a)&(d), 19; Action Taken, NPA Accounts, Economic Interest, Compiling of Information; Art. 12 of the Constitution]CIC Decision dated 24.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Ex Nb Sub U.S. Maurya, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Records Signals - CIC: "Relevant extracts relating to
medical fitness wherever available in the Work Charter be provided to theappellant." [Sections 8(1)(a)&(j); Army Branch (Work Order)]CIC Decision dated 24.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Banarasi Rai, Madya Pradesh Vs. CPIO, CBI, Madhya Pradesh V
organization to which the RTI Act does not apply as per Section 24(1); Action Taken]CIC Decision dated 15.06.2016 on Appeal filed by
Shri Chayan Ghosh Chowdhury, Lucknow Vs. Punjab & Sind Bank, New Delhi - CIC: While providing the information on point No. 4, the CPIO should sever / blot out from the orders, copies of which are to be provided to the Appellant, the names and any other information of a personal nature (such as date of birth, personal address and family details
etc.) concerning the officials, in whose case the Officer was conferred the power of disciplinary authority. .... The Commission that the FAA should give a personal hearing to those appellants who request for it. [Sections 8(1)(j), 10; Disciplinary Action, Personal Hearing by FAA]CIC
Decision dated 09.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Arun Kumar Agarwal, Bangalore Vs. Security & Exchange Board of India (SEBI), Mumbai (Full Bench Decision) - CIC: The appellant in the instant case had not made a bona fide public interest in seeking information, the disclosure of such information was likely to cause unwarranted invasion of
privacy of the individual under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act. It being so, the Commission were not inclined to allow disclosure of the requested information. [Sections 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act. It being so, the Commission were not inclined to allow disclosure of the requested information. [Sections 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act. It being so, the Commission were not inclined to allow disclosure of the requested information. [Sections 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act. It being so, the Commission were not inclined to allow disclosure of the requested information. [Sections 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act. It being so, the Commission were not inclined to allow disclosure of the requested information. [Sections 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act. It being so, the Commission were not inclined to allow disclosure of the requested information. [Sections 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act. It being so, the Commission were not inclined to allow disclosure of the requested information. [Sections 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act. It being so, the Commission were not inclined to allow disclosure of the requested information. [Sections 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act. It being so, the Commission were not inclined to allow disclosure of the requested information. [Sections 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act. It being so, the Commission were not inclined to allow disclosure of the requested information. [Sections 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act. It being so, the Commission were not inclined to allow disclosure of the requested information. [Sections 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act. It being so, the Commission were not inclined to allow disclosure of the requested information. [Sections 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act. It being so, the Commission were not inclined to allow disclosure of the requested information. [Sections 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act. It being so, the Commission were not inclined to allow disclosure of the requested information. [Section 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act. It being so, the RTI Act. It being so 
The Commission directed the respondent authority to spell out their policy on compensation for the doctors dying on duty due to exposure to infectious diseases, such as the case of husband of the appellant under section 4(1)(c) of the RTI Act. [Sections 4(1)(c), 19; Action Taken, Hospital, Hon'ble Commission's Direction]CIC Decision dated
06.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Mr. Onkar Nath, Allahabad Vs. CPIO, Ordnance Factory Board, Kolkata [Sections 8(1)(a) & (d), 10]CIC Decision dated 26.05.2016 on Appeal/Complaint filed by Shri Gurmeet Singh, Delhi Vs. Safdarjang Hospital & VMMC, New Delhi - Upon a query from the Commission as to why procedure envisaged under Section 11 of
the RTI Act was not resorted to, the CPIO stated that considering the fact of ongoing legal dispute between the appellant and the patient, he was not inclined to make disclosure. The First Appellate Authority's Order was upheld. [Sections 8(1)(e), 11; Medical Record, Court Case, Hospital]CIC Decision dated 25.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Mr. Vikas
Sethi, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Department of Income Tax, New Delhi - The assessment proceedings had been completed. Hence the Commission decided that the CPIO should disclose the broad outcome of the TEP (Tax Evasion Petition) to the appellant. [Income Tax, New Delhi - The assessment proceedings had been completed. Hence the CPIO should disclose the broad outcome of the TEP (Tax Evasion Petition) to the appellant. [Income Tax, New Delhi - The assessment proceedings had been completed. Hence the CPIO should disclose the broad outcome of the TEP (Tax Evasion Petition) to the appellant. [Income Tax, New Delhi - The assessment proceedings had been completed. Hence the CPIO should disclose the broad outcome of the TEP (Tax Evasion Petition) to the appellant. [Income Tax, Tax Evasion Petition, Action Taken] CIC Decision dated 13.05.2016 on Appeal filed by the complete the c
Shri Gaurav Sethi Vs. University Grants Commission -The CIC, inter alia, directed PIO of Mahatma Gandhi University, Meghalaya considering him as deemed PIO to show cause why information was not provided to the appellant and why maximum
penalty should not be imposed against them for non-furnishing of information, within 21 days from the date of receipt of this order. [Sections 18, 20; Action Taken Report]CIC Decision dated 06.05.2016 on Complaint filed by Shri S.C. Agrawal Vs. Constitution Club of India (Full Bench Decision) - The CIC, inter alia, directed the concerned CPIOs to
produce the lease deed and the file relating to the lease deed along with correspondence or any other relevant documents pertaining to the CCI, etc. before the Commission, and also directed the CPIOs of CPWD and the Director (Works), Ministry of Urban Development to show cause why maximum penalty should not be imposed against each of them
Appeal filed by Shri Rameshwar Das Bhankhar Vs. Kendrya Vidyalaya Sansthan, N. Delhi - CIC: "The appellant had sought information about a post in computer science, qualifications required for the Post of PG Teacher, copy of rules, whether the candidates, who secured the degree through distance education are eligible, etc. This is the information
 which the Public Authority is under obligation to voluntarily disclose under Section 4(1)(b) of the RTI Act and place the same in the web site." [Sections 4(1)(b) and 20; Appointment]CIC Decision dated 12.03.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Hemant Dhage Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi - The CIC, inter-alia, decided: "33. .....
the Commission declares that the office of the Minister for Law as public authority under Section 2(h) of Right to Information Act, and under Section 4(1)(b) including
facility of meeting people. 34. The Commission strongly recommends to implement the recommendations of NCRWC, Second ARC and replace the 'oath of secrecy' with 'oath of transparency" so that the Minister will respect the right to information of the citizen, which was passed by the Parliament and considered as fundamental right intrinsic in
Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution, and be answerable/accountable to the citizens." [Sections 2(h), 4(1)(b), 8(1), 8(2), 19(8) and 22; Appointment with Minister] CIC Decision dated 10.03.2016 on Appeal filed by Nirmal Kanta Vs. Laxmi Bai College, Delhi University - [Sections 4(1)(b), 8(1)(a) and (j) and 20; Civil/Building Works, DI] CIC Decision dated
08.03.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Bipin Kumar Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board, Nangal - CIC: "... without commenting upon the merits of the present appeal filed by Shri Bipin Kumar Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board, Nangal - CIC: "... without commenting upon the merits of the present appeal filed by Shri Bipin Kumar Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board, Nangal - CIC: "... without commenting upon the merits of the present appeal filed by Shri Bipin Kumar Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board, Nangal - CIC: "... without commenting upon the merits of the present appeal filed by Shri Bipin Kumar Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board, Nangal - CIC: "... without commenting upon the merits of the present appeal filed by Shri Bipin Kumar Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board, Nangal - CIC: "... without commenting upon the merits of the present appeal filed by Shri Bipin Kumar Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board, Nangal - CIC: "... without commenting upon the merits of the present appeal filed by Shri Bipin Kumar Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board, Nangal - CIC: "... without commenting upon the merits of the present appeal filed by Shri Bipin Kumar Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board, Nangal - CIC: "... without commenting upon the merits of the present appeal filed by Shri Bipin Kumar Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board, Nangal - CIC: "... without commenting upon the merits of the present appeal filed by Shri Bipin Kumar Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board, Nangal - CIC: "... without commenting upon the merits of the present appeal filed by Shri Bipin Kumar Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board, Nangal - CIC: "... without commenting upon the merits of the present appeal filed by Shri Bipin Kumar Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board, Nangal - CIC: "... without commenting upon the merits of the present appeal filed by Shri Bipin Kumar Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board, Nangal - CIC: "... without commenting upon the merits of the present appeal filed by Shri Bipin Kumar Vs. Bhakra Beas Management Board, Nangal Bipin Bipin Bipin Bipin Bipin Bipin Bipin Bipin Bipin 
after affording an opportunity of hearing to the appellant." (First Appellate Authority, Burden of Proof)CIC Decision dated 07.03.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Anil Sood Vs. Sub Divisional Magistrate (Election), Govt. of NCT of Delhi
CIC: "It is not proper on the part of public authority to suppress the information on such vital aspects, inspite of CIC Order. Commission recommends that most of the information as sought by the appellant should have been published under section 4(1)(b), accordingly, there should be proper updating of section 4(1)(b). Commission directs public
authority to take necessary steps to update the official website with such information at regular intervals." [Sections 2(f), 4(1)(b); Voters List]CIC Decision dated 23.02.2016 on Complaint/Appeal filed by Shri Dinesh Chandra Vs. Medical Council of India, New Delhi - The CIC, inter alia, decided that in the event of non-receipt of response (of the CPIO)
within the stipulated period, the Commission shall proceed with the penalty proceedings, in due course of law, on the basis of information available on record. [Sections 2(f), 4(1)(b); Voters List]CIC Decision dated 08.02.2016 on Appeal filed by Mr. Hemant Kumar Agarwal, Sarguja, Chhattisgarh Vs. CPIO & Supdt. of Post Office, Raigad - CIC: "... ...
the RTI Act does not require the public authority to retain records for indefinite period. The information needs to be retained as per the record retention schedule applicable to the concerned public authority." [Sections 8(3), 19(8)] CIC Decision dated 08.02.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri S. Poovendran, Salem Distt. Vs. CPIO, Southern Railway, Chennai
- CIC: "During the pendency of an RTI appeal, the records should not have been destroyed." [Retention of Records]CIC Decision dated 15.01.2016 - Abne Ingty vs. CPIO,
Delhi University, New Delhi - The CIC, inter alia, directed all the Universities in India, including deemed Universities and all examining bodies to provide copies of answer sheet only at a cost of Rs 2 per page and make necessary changes to their respective notifications accordingly as soon as possible but not beyond 30 days. [Sections 4(1), 7, 8(1)(d),
18(1)(d), 19(8)(a) & 22 of RTI Act and Rule 4 of the Fee & Cost Rules] CIC Decision dated 16.12.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Maniram Sharma, Distt. Churu, Rajasthan Vs. Min. of Communication & IT, NIC, New Delhi (Full Bench Decision) - The CIC, inter alia, decided that as per appellant's request the NIC shall compile the GOI Web Directory at the
earliest in larger public interest and all public authorities concerned shall expeditiously provide the necessary data to NIC to complete the task. [Sections 43 & 72 of the IT Act, Art. 51 of the Constitution] CIC Decision dated 11.12.2015 on Appeal from Smt. Mukesh
Devi, Distt. Alwar Vs. CPIO, Office of DG, CISF Camp, New Delhi - CIC: ".... the Commission would like the CISF to consider the request of the complainant and provide information to the extent possible to the appellant. (Section 24(1), Exempt Organisation) CIC Decision dated 09.12.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University The CIC,
inter alia, ordered that "Public authority should read Section 16 of Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 along with the rules made under this Act and circulars of DoPT which specifically direct them to provide a copy of sexual harassment complaint to charged officer." [Section 8(1)(e),(g) and
(j), Complaint of Sexual Harassment] CIC Decision dated 30.11.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Nirmal Kumar Agarwal, Kheri (UP) Vs. CPIO, Department of Posts, Kheri - CIC: "After
 hearing submissions of both the parties the Commission directs the CPIO to provide copy of the investigation report regarding the account(s) of the appellant & his family members ..." (Investigation Report, Post Office Account(s) of the appellant & his family members ..."
Kanpur - CIC: "The RTI Act is not the proper law for redressal of grievances/disputes and there are other appropriate forum(s) for resolving such matters." (RTI not appropriate forum for redressal of grievances/disputes). CIC Decision dated 09.11.2015 on Appeal from Shri R.K. Jain Vs. Delhi University - CIC: "The Commission ... ... considers that it is
a case where the CPIO returned the original RTI application along with the IPO, which means a total and complete refusal to act under the provisions of RTI Act. The Commission directs the CPIO to explain and show cause as to why maximum penalty should not be imposed against him and why
compensation should not be granted to the appellant and disciplinary action should not be recommended against him. "CIC Decision dated 09.11.2015 on Appeal from Mr. A. Bidyadhar, S.P.M. Sumandala, Ganjam (Odisha) Vs. Department of Posts, Berhampur-760001 - The CPIO's representative stated that he will supply copy of the LTC bill submitted
by the appellant along with the relevant file notings vide which sanction was accorded. The CIC decided that the CPIO's representative should supply the information as above to the appellant. * CIC Decision dated 21.10.2015 on Appeal from Mr. David George Thomas Vs. Ministry of Environment & Forests - The Commission directed the respondent
 public authority, inter alia, to explain reasons for this non-publication of policy related information about Solar Thermal projects as mandated by Section 4(1) of RTI Act, to explain why adequate compensation should not be given to the appellant, and to provide necessary training to CPIOs to understand their duties under Environment Protection Act,
RTI Act, duties as the CPIO representing the entire public authority.* CIC Decision dated 21.10.2015 on Appeal from Mr. David George Thomas Vs. Ministry of Environment & Forests - The Commission directed the respondent public authority, inter alia, to explain reasons for this non-publication of policy related information about Solar Thermal
projects as mandated by Section 4(1) of RTI Act, to explain why adequate compensation should not be given to the appellant, and to provide necessary training to CPIOs to understand their duties under Environment Protection Act, RTI Act, duties as the CPIO representing the entire public authority. [Sections 4(1)(d) & (e)] * CIC Decision dated
15.10.2015 on Appeal from Shri Durga Prasad Kushwaha, Katni Vs. Life Insurance Corporation of India, Jabalpur - The Commission held that the attendance in respect of employees of public authority is disclosable information and the CPIO was directed to provide computerized attendance sheet in respect of the former Branch Manager, LIC, for the
specified period in 2013, severing any personal information like the reason of leave/not attending etc. [Sections 8(1)(e),(g) & (j)] * CIC Decision dated 23.09.2015 on Appeal from Indian Technomac Company Ltd., New Delhi - CIC: "However, the crux of the matter is that the information should have been
sought by a citizen in his individual capacity. .... in the instant case, there is no doubt whatsoever that M/s Indian Technomac Company Ltd. were the RTI applicant, the Appellant before the RTI Act." (Sections 8(1)(d) & (e), 19)* CIC Decision 8(1)(d) & (e), 19)* 
dated 11.09.2015 on Appeal from Shri Biswamber Nayak Vs. Batra Hospital & Medical Research Centre, New Delhi - Batra Hospital is covered under the RTI Act. [Section 2(h)] * CIC Decision dated 07.09.2015 on Appeal from Shri Biswamber Nayak Vs. Batra Hospital is covered under the RTI Act. [Section 2(h)] * CIC Decision dated 07.09.2015 on Appeal from Shri Biswamber Nayak Vs. Batra Hospital is covered under the RTI Act. [Section 2(h)] * CIC Decision dated 07.09.2015 on Appeal from Shri Biswamber Nayak Vs. Batra Hospital is covered under the RTI Act. [Section 2(h)] * CIC Decision dated 07.09.2015 on Appeal from Shri Biswamber Nayak Vs. Batra Hospital is covered under the RTI Act. [Section 2(h)] * CIC Decision dated 07.09.2015 on Appeal from Shri Biswamber Nayak Vs. Batra Hospital is covered under the RTI Act. [Section 2(h)] * CIC Decision dated 07.09.2015 on Appeal from Shri Biswamber Nayak Vs. Batra Hospital is covered under the RTI Act. [Section 2(h)] * CIC Decision dated 07.09.2015 on Appeal from Shri Biswamber Nayak Vs. Batra Hospital is covered under the RTI Act. [Section 2(h)] * CIC Decision dated 07.09.2015 on Appeal from Shri Biswamber Nayak Vs. Batra Hospital is covered under the RTI Act. [Section 2(h)] * CIC Decision dated 07.09.2015 on Appeal from Shri Biswamber Nayak Vs. Batra Hospital is covered under the RTI Act. [Section 2(h)] * CIC Decision dated 07.09.2015 on Appeal from Shri Biswamber Nayak Vs. Batra Hospital is covered under the RTI Act. [Section 2(h)] * CIC Decision dated 07.09.2015 on Appeal from Shri Biswamber Nayak Vs. Batra Hospital is covered under the RTI Act. [Section 2(h)] * CIC Decision dated 07.09.2015 on Appeal from Shri Biswamber Nayak Vs. Batra Hospital is covered under the RTI Act. [Section 2(h)] * CIC Decision dated 07.09.2015 on Appeal from Shri Biswamber Nayak Vs. Batra Hospital is covered under the RTI Act. [Section 2(h)] * CIC Decision dated 07.09.2015 on Appeal from Shri Biswamber Nayak Vs. Batra Hospital is covered under the RTI Act. [Section 2(h)] * CIC Decision dated 07.09.
Commissioner of Revenue Department Head Quarters (Delhi), inter alia, to explain to the appellant and the Commission what measures they have taken to correct the unconstitutionally given caste certificates to Chamars as "Jatavs", etc., since 2011 till today, and when do they start certifying the applicants with their original caste names. (SC
Certificate)* CIC Decision dated 13.08.2015 on Appeal from Shri Sunhash Chandra Agrawal Vs. PIO, Min. of Environment, Forests & Climate Change, New Delhi - CIC: The Commission directed the respondent officer to provide complete information for points 7 and 8 of the RTI application together with related documents free of cost ... The
Commission also directed the CPIO/PMO and CPIO/DOPT to provide information sought, appear before the Commission to report compliance to the Commission dated 10.08.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Chandratan, Ahmedabad Vs. CPIO, Office of Commissioner, Income Tax Department, Surat - CIC: The
appellant has not succeeded in establishing that the information sought was for larger public purpose. [Sec. 8(1)(j), Larger Public Interest] * CIC Decision dated 03.08.2015 - Ms. Poonam Kumari, Ghaziabad Vs. CPIO, Staff Selection Commssion, New Delhi - CIC: The Commission directed the CPIO to communicate the reason for non-selection of the
candidate. * CIC Decision dated 03.06.2015 on Appeal filed by Rakhee Marwah Vs. PIO, SDM (Saket), New Delhi - CIC: The Commission found reasonable grounds to inquire (as provided under Section 19(2) of RTI Act) into the matter of issuing income certificate to a person, and into the allegation of suppressing the file, partly in the beginning and
some part even now, and furnish report to the Commission within 30 days. The Commission also directed the respondent authority to pay compensation in stipulated time on the pretext of missing file.* CIC Decision dated 30.04.2015 on Appeal from
Surender Vishwakarma Vs. Department of Justice, GOI, New Delhi - CIC: The Commission having heard the submissions and perused the record, observes that is for 63 years which is very unreasonable as the same is very voluminous. The appellant ..... could not convince the
Commission why he needs this huge information. The Commission, therefore, does not interfere with the FAA order and dismisses the appeal from Ms. Jyoti Arora Vs. Pusa Polytechnic, Delhi - The Commission directed the PIO/DTTE to inform the reasons for delay in giving the
appellant the selection grade and also provide complete correspondence between the respondent and the DTTE within 15 days The Commission also directed to show cause why penalty cannot be imposed on them for not giving complete information to the appellant. (Disclosure of Reasons)* CIC Decision dated 10.04.2015 on Appeal from Ms. Jyoti
 Jeena Vs. Institue of Human Behaviour & Allied Sciences, Delhi - CIC: "Hence, the Commission holds that there is a larger public interest the respondent authority to furnish the information about the medical records of her husband to the extent.
 (Sections 2,3,4,6(2),7,8,11,18,19, Right to Privacy, Larger Public Interest)* CIC Decision dated 31.03.2015 on Appeal from Shri Shantaram Vs. New India Assurance Corporation to issue instructions to all the Divisional Offices for charging correct premium in this regard under
intimation to the Commission. * CIC Decision dated 19.03.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Dharampal, Gurgaon Vs. CPIO & Supdt. of Post Offices, Gurgaon - The Commission directed the department to compensate the appellant by an amount of Rs.1000/- for the inconvenience and detriment caused to him. [Section 19(8)(b)]. * CIC Decision dated
19.03.2015 on Appeal from Dr. Ram Kumar, Jaipur Vs. Controller of Communication Acts, Deptt. of Telecommunications, Shimla - The basic protection afforded by virtue of the exemption from disclosure would be in 'public interest'
 [Section 8(1)(j)] * DoPT Circular dated 17.03.2015 - Format for giving information to the applicants under RTI Act. - Delhi High Court Judgment dated 10.03.2015 - Subhash Chandra Agrawal Vs.
Office of Attorney General and R.K. Jain Vs. Office of Attorney General of India * CIC Decision dated 04.03.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Jitendra Anandrao Chauhan, Kolhapur Central Prison Vs. Department of Posts, New Delhi - The Department of Posts has been requested to look into the issue and take appropriate steps to provide access to PIN code to
prisoners lodged in various jails. (Larger Public Interest) * CIC Decision dated 03.03.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Baladevan Rangaraju Vs. PIO, Delhi Commission for Women, GNCTD, New Delhi (Non-Disclosure Agreement, Section 10) * CIC Decision dated 03.03.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Baladevan Rangaraju Vs. PIO, Delhi Commission for Women, GNCTD, New Delhi (Non-Disclosure Agreement, Section 10) * CIC Decision dated 03.03.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Baladevan Rangaraju Vs. PIO, Delhi Commission for Women, GNCTD, New Delhi (Non-Disclosure Agreement, Section 10) * CIC Decision dated 03.03.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Baladevan Rangaraju Vs. PIO, Delhi Commission for Women, GNCTD, New Delhi (Non-Disclosure Agreement, Section 10) * CIC Decision dated 03.03.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Baladevan Rangaraju Vs. PIO, Delhi Commission for Women, GNCTD, New Delhi (Non-Disclosure Agreement, Section 10) * CIC Decision dated 03.03.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Baladevan Rangaraju Vs. PIO, Delhi Commission for Women, GNCTD, New Delhi (Non-Disclosure Agreement, Section 10) * CIC Decision dated 03.03.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Baladevan Rangaraju Vs. PIO, Delhi Commission for Women, GNCTD, New Delhi (Non-Disclosure Agreement, Section 10) * CIC Decision dated 03.03.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Baladevan Rangaraju Vs. PIO, Delhi Commission for Women, GNCTD, New Delhi Commission 
New Delhi (Voluminous Records, Section 10) * CIC Decision dated 26.02.2015 on Appeal from Shri Anbuvendhan, Chennai Vs. the CPIO, National Commission for Scheduled Castes, New Delhi [Section 5(4)] * CIC Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Shri Anbuvendhan, Chennai Vs. the CPIO, National Commission for Scheduled Castes, New Delhi (Section 5(4)) * CIC Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Shri Anbuvendhan, Chennai Vs. the CPIO, National Commission for Scheduled Castes, New Delhi (Section 5(4)) * CIC Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Shri Anbuvendhan, Chennai Vs. the CPIO, National Commission for Scheduled Castes, New Delhi (Section 5(4)) * CIC Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Shri Anbuvendhan, Chennai Vs. the CPIO, National Commission for Scheduled Castes, New Delhi (Section 5(4)) * CIC Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Shri Anbuvendhan, Chennai Vs. the CPIO, National Commission for Scheduled Castes, New Delhi (Section 5(4)) * CIC Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Shri Anbuvendhan, Chennai Vs. the CPIO, National Commission for Scheduled Castes, New Delhi (Section 5(4)) * CIC Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Shri Anbuvendhan, Chennai Vs. the CPIO, National Commission for Scheduled Castes, New Delhi (Section 5(4)) * CIC Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Shri Anbuvendhan, Chennai Vs. the CPIO, National Castes, New Delhi (Section 5(4)) * CIC Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Shri Anbuvendhan, Chennai Vs. the CPIO, National Castes, New Delhi (Section 5(4)) * CIC Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Shri Anbuvendhan, Chennai Vs. the CPIO, National Castes, New Delhi (Section 5(4)) * CIC Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Shri Anbuvendhan, Chennai Vs. the CPIO, National Castes, New Delhi (Section 5(4)) * CIC Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Shri Anbuvendhan, Chennai Vs. the CPIO, National Castes, New Delhi (Section 5(4)) * CIC Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal Castes, New Delhi (Section 5(4)) * CIC Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal Castes, N
directed the CPIO of MoEF to, inter alia, perform their obligation under Section 4(1)(d) of RTI Act, 2005, and to furnish the reasons for formulating the DDA to go ahead with unrestricted installation of Mobile Towers in the lands of DDA, in spite of recommendations against.
The Commission also recommended the Chief Minister's Office and office of Lieutenant Governor to probe into the recommendations of the
Inter Ministerial Group or if they have rejected the recommendation, the reasons and grounds for the same. (Sections 4(1)(c)&(d)/Disclosure of Reasons) * CIC Decision dated 18.02.2015 on Appeal from Shri Shyam Mohan Parashar, Faridabad Vs. Dte. of Training and Technical Education, Delhi - "The Commission directed the respondent authority to
furnish information to the appellant as to the reasons for denial of Selection 4(1)(c). ..." (Section 4(1)(c)/Disclosure of Reasons) * O.M. dated 17.02.2015 - Guidelines for Public Information Officers/FAAs for supply of information and disposal of first appeal respectively - reiteration
of >>> RTI - Rules/Circulars * Decision dated 05.02.2015 on Complaint from Shri Pradeep Sharma Vs. Social Welfare Officer (respondent) - "The Commission reiterates that the Bar Council of Delhi should initiate proceedings against the complainant for alleged misconduct of sending a blank paper as RTI application and causing wastage of public
money and time of Public Authority." (Misuse of RTI/Action against Complainant) * Decision dated 03.02.2015 on Complainant from Shri Roshan Lal Vs. Registrar of Cooperative Societies, Delhi - "The Commission after hearing the submissions made directs the PIO to obtain the information from the Society and furnish the same to the Complainant
within thirty days of receipt of this order." (Section 18) * CIC Decision dated 02.02.2015 on Complaint from Shri Roshan Lal Vs. Deptt. of Health & Family Welfare, GNCTD, Delhi - "The Commission, therefore, directs the respondent authority to inquire into the complaint of the complaint from Shri Roshan Lal Vs. Deptt. of Health & Family Welfare, GNCTD, Delhi - "The Commission, therefore, directs the respondent authority to inquire into the complaint of the complaint from Shri Roshan Lal Vs. Deptt. of Health & Family Welfare, GNCTD, Delhi - "The Commission, therefore, directs the respondent authority to inquire into the complaint from Shri Roshan Lal Vs. Deptt. of Health & Family Welfare, GNCTD, Delhi - "The Commission, therefore, directs the respondent authority to inquire into the complaint from Shri Roshan Lal Vs. Deptt. of Health & Family Welfare, GNCTD, Delhi - "The Commission, therefore, directs the respondent authority to inquire into the complaint from Shri Roshan Lal Vs. Deptt. of Health & Family Welfare, GNCTD, Delhi - "The Commission, therefore, directs the respondent authority to inquire into the complaint from Shri Roshan Lal Vs. Deptt. of Health & Family Welfare, GNCTD, Delhi - "The Commission, therefore, directs the respondent authority to inquire into the complaint from Shri Roshan Lal Vs. Deptt. of Health & Family Welfare, GNCTD, Delhi - "The Commission of Health & Family Welfare, GNCTD, Delhi - "The Commission of Health & Family Welfare, GNCTD, Delhi - "The Commission of Health & Family Welfare, GNCTD, Delhi - "The Commission of Health & Family Welfare, GNCTD, Delhi - "The Commission of Health & Family Welfare, GNCTD, Delhi - "The Commission of Health & Family Welfare, GNCTD, Delhi - "The Commission of Health & Family Welfare, GNCTD, Delhi - "The Commission of Health & Family Welfare, GNCTD, Delhi - "The Commission of Health & The Commi
days from the date of receipt of this order." (Section 18) * CIC Decision dated 02.02.2015 on Appeal from Shri SKT Sherman Vs. RCS, GNCTD, New Delhi "The Commission also advises the appellant not to file repeated RTI applications which are aimless and useless. The Commission also advises the respondent authority not to share any personal
information of the officers with the people like the appellant without invoking Section 11 of the RTI Act." (Abuse of RTI) * CIC Decision dated 02.02.2015 on Appeal from Dr. Satya Prakash, Delhi Vs. Lalit Kala Akademi, New Delhi - "The CPIO is directed to provide to the Appellant copies of such agreements, if available on the records of the public
FAA to strictly follow the RTI regime while disposing of appeals and pass a speaking order, after taking due cognizance of merits of each case. * CIC Decision dated 27.01.2015 on Appeal from Shri Harsh Vardhan Nayyar, New Delhi - "... names, addresses and phone nos./email addresses of all plaintiffs cannot be provided to the
 appellant as the same is third party information u/s 8(1)(j), the disclosure of which serves no larger public interest in seeking the information. Therefore, his plea for award of compensation is not accepted." * Copy of Minutes of the CIC Meeting dated 13.12.2011,
reg. norms for according priority to appeals/complaints filed before the Commission (As on CIC website-01.02.15) * CIC Decision dated 27.01.2015 on Appeal from Mr. M. Mahadevappa Vs. CPIO & DGM (HR/Admn.), BSNL, Mysore - "The appellant has not succeeded in demonstrating that the information asked for by him is in larger public interest. It
being so, there is no need to interfere with the respondent's decision." [Section 8(1)(j)] * CIC Decision dated 21.01.2015 on Appeal from Ms. Harpreet Kaur Vs. Delhi Subordinate Selection Board, Delhi - "... the candidate with regard to his/her own answer sheet can obtain the copy of the same as a matter of right, but with regard to the answer sheet
taking a final decision by the PIO in this respect. [Sections 3, 8(1)(j), 11 and 19(3)] * CIC Decision dated 16.01.2015 on Appeal from Sh. Subhash Chandra Agrawal Vs. Department for the Welfare of SC/ST/OBC, GNCTD, Delhi - "The Commission require the Chief Secretary of Delhi and Union Cabinet Secretary to disclose their policy on this issue
under Section 4 of Right to Information Act and also inform the appellants about their proposed steps to implement recommendation of Lokayuktha of Delhi in effectively preventing photo publicity of the political rulers." * CIC Decision dated 14.01.2015 on Complaint from Sh. Subhash Chandra Agrawal Vs. National Green Tribunal, New Delhi - The
Commission recommended change of officer to be designated as FAA. * CIC Decision dated 08.01.2015 on Appeal from Shri S.N. Shukla, Lucknow Vs. Department of Justice, Govt. of India, New Delhi - The CIC has directed
the Law Ministry to disclose the Cabinet note about the decision to establish a National Judicial Appointments Commission, saying that such documents are not secret and should thus be made public. * CIC Decision dated 17.12.2014 - Mr. Francis Assis Fernandes, Indore Vs. CPIO & Sr. Supdt. of Post Offices, Ujjain [Sections 8(1)(e), 8(1)(j)] * Delhi
HC Judgement dated 04.12.2014 - The Registrar, Supreme Court of India Vs. Commodore Lokesh K. Batra and Ors. - Hon'ble Delhi High Court: "I find no infirmity with the impugned order in so far as it directs that the records may be maintained in a manner so that the information regarding the period for which the judgments are pending after
being reserved, is available with the petitioner in future." [Sections 4(1)(b), 7(9) and 19(8)(a)(iv)] * CIC Decision dated 01.12.2014 - Attar Singh Kaushik Vs. Education Deptt., GNCTD, Delhi - CIC: "The Commission after hearing the submissions made directs the PIO to conduct an inquiry u/s 18(2) of the RTI Act to find out reasons and officer
responsible for delay in payment of remuneration to the Appellant for nearly three years, for initiating disciplinary action against such officer. ..." * CIC Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi - CIC: "The Appellate Authority is cautioned not to dismiss any appeals without reading the
contents of the appeals or hearing the parties." * CIC Decision dated 10.10.2014 - Sarla Verma Vs. Delhi Jal Board - "The Commission ... ... recommends the Public Authority to treat the RTI application as a complaint and as a regulatory initiate action against the persons who had installed nonfunctioning meters." * Madras High Court Judgement
the complaints and representations received from the second respondent." * Decision dated 20.08.2014 - Dr. Srinivas Vyas Vs. Ayurvedic and Unani Tibbia College & Hospital, GNCTD, New Delhi - "The Commission recommends the respondent authority to prepare a consolidated report of the appellant's RTI applications and upload the same in their
website, showing it as a case of misuse of RTI." Section 2 * Section 3 * Section 3 * Section 2 * Section 20 *
of Central Information Commission - Section-Wise Decisions of Central Information (CIC) - Subject-WiseSection 2— Section 2(f) - Definition of 'Information' CIC Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav Das Vs. CPIO, Department of Health & Family Welfare (1.9 MiB, 362 hits) CIC Decision dated 13.08.2021
on the Second Appeal/Complaint filed by Shri Shyamlal Yadav Vs. PIO, CPV Division, Ministry of External Affairs (729.2 KiB, 374 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.02.2020 on the Second Appeal/Complaint filed by Shri Kuldeep Kumar Baranwal v. CPIO, Prime Minister's Office, New Delhi (489.0 KiB, 1,300 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.02.2020 on the Second Appeal/Complaint filed by Shri Kuldeep Kumar Baranwal v. CPIO, Prime Minister's Office, New Delhi (489.0 KiB, 1,300 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.02.2020 on the Second Appeal/Complaint filed by Shri Kuldeep Kumar Baranwal v. CPIO, Prime Minister's Office, New Delhi (489.0 KiB, 1,300 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.02.2020 on the Second Appeal/Complaint filed by Shri Kuldeep Kumar Baranwal v. CPIO, Prime Minister's Office, New Delhi (489.0 KiB, 1,300 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.02.2020 on the Second Appeal/Complaint filed by Shri Kuldeep Kumar Baranwal v. CPIO, Prime Minister's Office, New Delhi (489.0 KiB, 1,300 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.02.2020 on the Second Appeal/Complaint filed by Shri Kuldeep Kumar Baranwal v. CPIO, Prime Minister's Office, New Delhi (489.0 KiB, 1,300 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.02.2020 on the Second Appeal/Complaint filed by Shri Kuldeep Kumar Baranwal v. CPIO, Prime Minister's Office, New Delhi (489.0 KiB, 1,300 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.02.2020 on the Second Appeal/Complaint filed by Shri Kuldeep Kumar Baranwal v. CPIO, Prime Minister filed by Shri Kuldeep Kumar Baranwal v. CPIO, Prime Minister filed by Shri Kuldeep Kumar Baranwal v. CPIO, Prime Minister filed by Shri Kuldeep Kumar Baranwal v. CPIO, Prime Minister filed by Shri Kuldeep Kumar Baranwal v. CPIO, Prime Minister filed by Shri Kuldeep Kumar Baranwal v. CPIO, Prime Minister filed by Shri Kuldeep Kumar Baranwal v. CPIO, Prime Minister filed by Shri Kuldeep Kumar Baranwal v. CPIO, Prime Minister filed by Shri Kuldeep Kumar Baranwal v. CPIO, Prime Minister filed by Shri Kuldeep Kumar Baranwal v. CPIO, Prime Minister filed by Shri Kuldeep Kumar Baranwal v. CPIO, Prime Minister filed by Shri Kuld
 Appeal by Mr. Amit Khera v. CPIO, Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited, Delhi (253.6 KiB, 1,924 hits) CIC Decision dated 06.02.2020 on the Second Appeal by Mr. Rana Ranjan v. CPIO, National Insurance Company Ltd., Bhavnagar, Gujarat (221.4 KiB, 1,658 hits) Delhi High Court judgment dated 17.12.2019 - Election Commission of India Vs.
Central Information Commission and Anr. (364.3 KiB, 2,007 hits) CIC Decision dated 12.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v. CPIO Election Commission of India, New Delhi (666.2 KiB, 4,090 hits) CIC Decision dated 25.04.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v. CPIO Election Commission of India, New Delhi (666.2 KiB, 4,090 hits) CIC Decision dated 25.04.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v. CPIO Election Commission of India, New Delhi (666.2 KiB, 4,090 hits) CIC Decision dated 12.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v. CPIO Election Commission of India, New Delhi (666.2 KiB, 4,090 hits) CIC Decision dated 12.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v. CPIO Election Commission of India, New Delhi (666.2 KiB, 4,090 hits) CIC Decision dated 12.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v. CPIO Election Commission of India, New Delhi (666.2 KiB, 4,090 hits) CIC Decision dated 12.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v. CPIO Election Commission of India, New Delhi (666.2 KiB, 4,090 hits) CIC Decision dated 12.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v. CPIO Election Commission dated 12.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v. CPIO Election Commission dated 12.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v. CPIO Election Commission dated 12.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v. CPIO Election Commission dated 12.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v. CPIO Election Commission dated 12.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v. CPIO Election Commission dated 12.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v. CPIO Election Commission dated 12.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v. CPIO Election Commission dated 12.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v. CPIO Election Commission dated 12.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v. CPIO Election Commission dated 12.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by 
dated 24.12.2018 - Mr. R.S. Rai v. CPIO, Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan, Jabalpur (173.2 KiB, 4,942 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.12.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sounder Rajan v. CPIO, Deptt. of Ex-Servicemen, New Delhi (148.8 KiB, 4,836 hits) CIC Decision dated 19.12.2018 - Nirmal Singh Dhiman v. CPIO, Deptt. of Ex-Servicemen, New Delhi (148.8 KiB, 4,836 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.12.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sounder Rajan v. CPIO, Deptt. of Ex-Servicemen, New Delhi (148.8 KiB, 4,836 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.12.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sounder Rajan v. CPIO, Deptt. of Ex-Servicemen, New Delhi (148.8 KiB, 4,836 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.12.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sounder Rajan v. CPIO, Deptt. of Ex-Servicemen, New Delhi (148.8 KiB, 4,836 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.12.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sounder Rajan v. CPIO, Deptt. of Ex-Servicemen, New Delhi (148.8 KiB, 4,836 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.12.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sounder Rajan v. CPIO, Deptt. of Ex-Servicemen, New Delhi (148.8 KiB, 4,836 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.12.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sounder Rajan v. CPIO, Deptt. of Ex-Servicemen, New Delhi (148.8 KiB, 4,836 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.12.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sounder Rajan v. CPIO, Deptt. of Ex-Servicemen, New Delhi (148.8 KiB, 4,836 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.12.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sounder Rajan v. CPIO, Deptt. of Ex-Servicemen, New Delhi (148.8 KiB, 4,836 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.12.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sounder Rajan v. CPIO, Deptt. of Ex-Servicemen, New Delhi (148.8 KiB, 4,836 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.12.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sounder Rajan v. CPIO, Deptt. of Ex-Servicemen, New Delhi (148.8 KiB, 4,836 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.12.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sounder Rajan v. CPIO, Deptt. of Ex-Servicemen, New Delhi (148.8 KiB, 4,836 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.12.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sounder Rajan v. CPIO, Deptt. of Ex-Servicemen, New Delhi (148.8 KiB, 4,836 hits) CI
KiB, 4,887 hits) CIC Decision dated 02.11.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the App
12.02.2018 - Paras Nath Singh Vs. Union of India (266.0 KiB, 8,670 hits) CIC Decision dated 24.02.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Anil Sood Vs. Sub Divisional Magistrate (Election), Govt. of NCT of Delhi (368.4 KiB, 9,442 hits) CIC Decision dated 10.04.2015 on Appeal from Ms. Jyoti Jeena Vs. Institute of Human Behaviour & Allied Sciences, Delhi
(525.4 KiB, 11,985 hits) CIC Decision dated 31.03.2015 on Appeal from Shri Shantaram Vs. New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Mumbai (136.5 KiB, 11,149 hits) Decision dated 31.12.2014 on complaint from Shri Shantaram Vs. New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Mumbai (136.5 KiB, 11,149 hits) Decision dated 31.03.2015 on Appeal from Shri Shantaram Vs. New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Mumbai (136.5 KiB, 11,149 hits) Decision dated 31.03.2015 on Appeal from Shri Shantaram Vs. New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Mumbai (136.5 KiB, 11,149 hits) Decision dated 31.03.2015 on Appeal from Shri Shantaram Vs. New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Mumbai (136.5 KiB, 11,149 hits) Decision dated 31.03.2015 on Appeal from Shri Shantaram Vs. New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Mumbai (136.5 KiB, 11,149 hits) Decision dated 31.03.2015 on Appeal from Shri Shantaram Vs. New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Mumbai (136.5 KiB, 11,149 hits) Decision dated 31.03.2015 on Appeal from Shri Shantaram Vs. New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Mumbai (136.5 KiB, 11,149 hits) Decision dated 31.03.2015 on Appeal from Shri Shantaram Vs. New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Mumbai (136.5 KiB, 11,149 hits) Decision dated 31.03.2015 on Appeal from Shri Shantaram Vs. New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Mumbai (136.5 KiB, 11,149 hits) Decision dated 31.03.2015 on Appeal from Shri Shantaram Vs. New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Mumbai (136.5 KiB, 11,149 hits) Decision dated 31.03.2015 on Appeal from Shri Shantaram Vs. New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Mumbai (136.5 KiB, 11,149 hits) Decision dated 31.03.2015 on Appeal from Shri Shantaram Vs. New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Mumbai (136.5 KiB, 11,149 hits) Decision dated 31.03.2015 on Appeal from Shri Shantaram Vs. New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Mumbai (136.5 KiB, 11,149 hits) Decision dated 31.03.2015 on Appeal from Shri Shantaram Vs. New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Mumbai (136.5 KiB, 11,149 hits) Decision dated 31.03.2015 on Appeal from Shri Shantaram Vs. New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Mumbai (136.5 KiB, 11,149 hits) Decision dated 31.03.2015 on Appeal from Shri Shantaram Vs. Ne
Office (209.9 KiB, 847 hits) Decision dated 13.02.2014 - R.K. Prasad Vs. Central Vigilance Commission, New Delhi (395.6 KiB, 911 hits) Decision dated 13.02.2014 - R.K. Prasad Vs. LIC of India, Kolkata Vs. LIC of India, Kolkata (91.7 KiB, 921 hits) Decision dated
27.09.2013 - Dr. Bijaya Kumar Samantaray Vs. Kolkata Port Trust, Kolkata (202.9 KiB, 1,094 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2013 - Dr. P.K. Srivastava, Distt. Una, H.P. Vs. CPIO, Department of Personnel & Training, New Delhi (209.6 KiB, 966)
hits) Decision dated 14.08.2013 - Shri K. Madhavan, Chennai Vs. CPIO, Deptt. of Personnel & Training, New Delhi (205.9 KiB, 860 hits) Decision dated 05.07.2013 - Shri B. Bharathi, Puducherry Vs. PIO, Madras High Court, Chennai Vs. CPIO, UPSC, New Delhi (205.9 KiB, 922 hits) Decision dated 05.07.2013 - Shri B. Bharathi, Puducherry Vs. PIO, Madras High Court, Chennai Vs. CPIO, UPSC, New Delhi (205.9 KiB, 922 hits) Decision dated 05.07.2013 - Shri B. Bharathi, Puducherry Vs. PIO, Madras High Court, Chennai Vs. CPIO, UPSC, New Delhi (205.9 KiB, 922 hits) Decision dated 05.07.2013 - Shri B. Bharathi, Puducherry Vs. PIO, Madras High Court, Chennai Vs. CPIO, UPSC, New Delhi (205.9 KiB, 922 hits) Decision dated 05.07.2013 - Shri B. Bharathi, Puducherry Vs. PIO, Madras High Court, Chennai Vs. CPIO, UPSC, New Delhi (205.9 KiB, 922 hits) Decision dated 05.07.2013 - Shri B. Bharathi, Puducherry Vs. PIO, Madras High Court, Chennai Vs. CPIO, UPSC, New Delhi (205.9 KiB, 922 hits) Decision dated 05.07.2013 - Shri B. Bharathi, Puducherry Vs. PIO, Madras High Court, Chennai Vs. CPIO, UPSC, New Delhi (205.9 KiB, 922 hits) Decision dated 05.07.2013 - Shri B. Bharathi, Puducherry Vs. PIO, Madras High Court, Chennai Vs. CPIO, UPSC, New Delhi (205.9 KiB, 922 hits) Decision dated 05.07.2013 - Shri B. Bharathi, Puducherry Vs. PIO, Madras High Court, Chennai Vs. CPIO, UPSC, New Delhi (205.9 KiB, 922 hits) Decision dated 05.07.2013 - Shri B. Bharathi, Puducherry Vs. PIO, Madras High Court, Chennai Vs. CPIO, UPSC, New Delhi (205.9 KiB, 922 hits) Decision dated 05.07.2013 - Shri B. Bharathi, Puducherry Vs. PIO, Madras High Court, Chennai Vs. CPIO, UPSC, New Delhi (205.9 KiB, 922 hits) Decision dated 05.07.2013 - Shri B. Bharathi, Puducherry Vs. PIO, Madras High Court, Chennai Vs. CPIO, UPSC, New Delhi (205.9 KiB, 922 hits) Decision dated 05.07.2013 - Shri B. Bharathi, Puducherry Vs. PIO, Madras High Court, Chennai Vs. CPIO, UPSC, PIO, Wall Chennai Vs. CPIO, UPSC, PIO, Wall Chennai Vs. CPIO, UPSC, PIO, Wall Chennai Vs. CPIO, UPSC, PIO, Wall
863 hits) Decision dated 31.08.2012 - Shri Vijay Gupta Vs. CPIO, Deptt. of Personnel & Training, New Delhi (207.7 KiB, 861 hits) Decision dated 15.05.2012 - Shri Vijay Gupta Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, New Delhi (194.3 KiB, 1,119
hits) Decision dated 03.04.2012 - Shri Ram M. Apte, Balgaum Vs. CPIO, High Court of Karnakatak, Bangaluru (204.9 KiB, 1,043 hits) Decision dated 20.11.2011 on Appeal from Shri Sarpal Singh Vs. National Commission for
Cement & Building Materials, Ballabhgarh (192.4 KiB, 1,110 hits) Decision dated 21.10.2011 on Appeal from Ms. Bimla Prakash, Delhi Vs. CPIO & DGM, Indian Overseas Bank, Central Office, Chennai (59.6 KiB, 1,110 hits) Decision dated 21.10.2011 - Mr. Ashwini Kumar Avasthi, Aligarh Vs. PIO & DGM, Vijay Bank, Bangaluru (57.6 KiB, 1,113 hits)
 Decision dated 04.08.2011 - Shri Rameshwar Lal Bagotia Vs. Rajasthan Drugs & Pharmaceuticals Ltd (A GOI Enterprise), Jaipur (358.1 KiB, 1,189 hits) — Section 2(h) - Definition of 'Public Authority' CIC Decision dated 06.12.2019 on the Complaint filed by Neeraj Sharma v. CPIO, National Payments Corporation of India, New Delhi (Full Bench
 Decision) (1.0 MiB, 1,608 hits) CIC Decision dated 11.07.2017 on the complaint filed by Shri Saurabh Bindal Vs. Delhi Lawn Tennis Association (uploaded on CIC website on 19.04.2018) (12.2 MiB, 6,359 hits) DoPT Notification dated 04.12.2017-Appointment of 17 SCS officers to the IAS (UP Cadre) (105.5 KiB, 862 hits) CIC Decision dated
16.09.2017 on the Second Appeal/Complaint filed by Shri Shailesh Gandhi, Shri Madhukar Ganpat Kukde and Shri Nimish S. Agarwal Vs. CDR Cell, IDBI Tower, Mumbai (Full Bench Decision) (16.9 MiB, 5,642 hits) CIC Decision dated 04.09.2017 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Ashwani Kumar Avasthi Vs. The CPIO, SBI, Mumbai & Director/GM
IBPS, Mumbai (Full Bench Decision) (9.0 MiB, 5,566 hits) CIC Decision dated 12.03.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Hemant Dhage Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (656.2 KiB, 9,851 hits) CIC Decision dated 11.09.2015 on Appeal from Shri Biswamber Nayak Vs. Batra Hospital & Medical Research Centre, New Delhi (519.8)
KiB, 7,215 hits) CIC Decision dated 19.06.2014 on the Appeal filed by Lt. Gen. S.S. Dahiya Vs. CPIO, Appellate Authority, Air Hqrs., New Delhi (233.9 KiB, 1,697 hits) Decision dated 04.07.2013 - Lt. Col. (Retd.) R.
Bansal Vs. Army Welfare Housing Organisation (AWHO) (Full Bench Occision) (257.0 KiB, 1,727 hits) Decision dated 03.06.2013 - Shri S.C. Aggarwal, Shri Anil Bailwal Vs. Parliament of India (Full Bench Occision) (257.0 KiB, 1,727 hits) Decision dated 03.06.2013 - Shri S.C. Aggarwal, Shri Anil Bailwal Vs. Parliament of India (Full Bench Occision) (257.0 KiB, 2,012 hits) download id="12977"]—Section 2 (j) Meaning of 'Right to Information' CIC Decision dated 22.06.2020 on the Second
Appeal by Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. CPIO, Office of Customs, Central Excise & Service Tax Settlement Commission, Mumbai/Kolkata/New Delhi/Chennai (584.0 KiB, 1,380 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.02.2020 on the Second Appeal by Mr. Amit Khera v. CPIO, Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited, Delhi (253.6 KiB, 1,924 hits) CIC Decision dated
06.02.2017 on Appeal filed by Shri Gopal Rao Gudi Vs.PIO, National Council of Science Museum (58.4 KiB, 9,078 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gulab Singh Rana, GM, Indian Overseas Bank, Chennai (805.4 KiB, 11,170 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.12.2015 on Appeal from Mr.
Maniram Sharma, Distt. Churu, Rajasthan Vs. Min. of Communication & IT, NIC, New Delhi (Full Bench Decision) (534.3 KiB, 9,575 hits) CIC Decision dated 31.03.2015 on Appeal from Shri Shantaram Vs.
New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Mumbai (136.5 KiB, 11,149 hits) CIC Decision dated 03.03.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Baladevan Rangaraju Vs. PIO, Delhi Commission for Women, GNCTD, New Delhi (212.9 KiB, 12,437 hits) Decision dated 05.08.2013 - Shri S. Joseph Balasundar, Chennai Vs. CPIO, UPSC, New Delhi (210.6 KiB, 922 hits) Decision dated
05.07.2013 - Shri B.Bharathi, Puducherry Vs. PIO, Madras High Court, Chennai (306.4 KiB, 899 hits) Decision dated 12.10.2011 - Mr. Veer Sain, Jaipur Vs. PIO & General Manager, RBI, Mumbai (71.8 KiB, 916 hits) — Section 2(n) CIC Decision dated 12.10.2011 - Mr. Veer Sain, Jaipur Vs. PIO & Sr. DMM, DRM Office, Northern Railway, News
Delhi (484.7 KiB, 7,702 hits) — PIO/CPIO Not Expected To Give Interpretation/Justification/Opinion Decision dated 24.11.2011 - Mr. Ramesh Kumar Anand, Steno., PGIMER, Chandigarh Vs. CPIO, PGIMER, Chandigarh (44.6 KiB, 1,100 hits) Section 3 Delhi High Court judgment dated 17.12.2019 - Election Commission of India Vs. Central
Information Commission and Anr. (364.3 KiB, 2,007 hits) CIC Decision dated 10.04.2015 on Appeal from Ms. Jyoti Jeena Vs. Institue of Human Behaviour & Allied Sciences, Delhi (525.4 KiB, 11,985 hits) Decision dated 21.01.2015 on Appeal from Ms. Harpreet Kaur Vs. Delhi Subordinate Selection Board, Delhi (454.9 KiB, 12,839 hits) Decision dated 21.01.2015 on Appeal from Ms. Harpreet Kaur Vs. Delhi Subordinate Selection Board, Delhi (454.9 KiB, 12,839 hits) Decision dated 21.01.2015 on Appeal from Ms. Harpreet Kaur Vs. Delhi Subordinate Selection Board, Delhi (454.9 KiB, 12,839 hits) Decision dated 21.01.2015 on Appeal from Ms. Harpreet Kaur Vs. Delhi Subordinate Selection Board, Delhi (454.9 KiB, 12,839 hits) Decision dated 21.01.2015 on Appeal from Ms. Harpreet Kaur Vs. Delhi Subordinate Selection Board, Delhi (454.9 KiB, 12,839 hits) Decision dated 21.01.2015 on Appeal from Ms. Harpreet Kaur Vs. Delhi Subordinate Selection Board, Delhi (454.9 KiB, 12,839 hits) Decision dated 21.01.2015 on Appeal from Ms. Harpreet Kaur Vs. Delhi Subordinate Selection Board, Delhi (454.9 KiB, 12,839 hits) Decision dated 21.01.2015 on Appeal from Ms. Harpreet Kaur Vs. Delhi Subordinate Selection Board, Delhi (454.9 KiB, 12,839 hits) Decision dated 21.01.2015 on Appeal from Ms. Harpreet Kaur Vs. Delhi Subordinate Selection Board, Delhi Subordinate
16.01.2015 on Appeal from Sh. Subhash Chandra Agrawal Vs. Department for the Welfare of SC/ST/OBC, GNCTD, Delhi (469.0 KiB, 709 hits) Decision dated 11.12.2014 - Shri Rohit Sabharwal Vs. Delhi Fire Service, GNCTD, Delhi (334.1 KiB, 819 hits) Decision dated 11.12.2014 - Shri Rohit Sabharwal Vs. Delhi Fire Service, GNCTD, Delhi (334.1 KiB, 819 hits) Decision dated 11.12.2014 - Shri Rohit Sabharwal Vs. Delhi Fire Service, GNCTD, Delhi (334.1 KiB, 819 hits) Decision dated 11.12.2014 - Shri Rohit Sabharwal Vs. Delhi Fire Service, GNCTD, Delhi (334.1 KiB, 819 hits) Decision dated 11.12.2014 - Shri Rohit Sabharwal Vs. Delhi Fire Service, GNCTD, Delhi (334.1 KiB, 819 hits) Decision dated 11.12.2014 - Shri Rohit Sabharwal Vs. Delhi Fire Service, GNCTD, Delhi (334.1 KiB, 819 hits) Decision dated 11.12.2014 - Shri Rohit Sabharwal Vs. Decision dated 11.12.2014 - Shri Rohit Sabhar
dated 25.11.2014 - Shri V.K. Jha Vs. Tis Hazari Court, Delhi (217.5 KiB, 892 hits) Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (271.0 KiB, 854 hits) Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (271.0 KiB, 854 hits) Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (271.0 KiB, 854 hits) Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (271.0 KiB, 854 hits) Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (271.0 KiB, 854 hits) Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (271.0 KiB, 854 hits) Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (271.0 KiB, 854 hits) Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (271.0 KiB, 854 hits) Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (271.0 KiB, 854 hits) Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (271.0 KiB, 854 hits) Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (271.0 KiB, 854 hits) Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (271.0 KiB, 854 hits) Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (271.0 KiB, 854 hits) Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (271.0 KiB, 854 hits) Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (271.0 KiB, 854 hits) Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. Decision dated 25.11.2014 
22.10.2014 - Shri Prem Raj Vs. Delhi Jal Board, GNCTD (310.6 KiB, 780 hits) Decision dated 20.08.2014 - Dr. Srinivas Vyas Vs. Ayurvedic and Unani Tibbia College & Hospital, GNCTD, New Delhi (387.7 KiB, 12,584 hits) Decision dated 23.05.2014 - Ms. Meenud Vyas Vs. Ayurvedic and Unani Tibbia College & Hospital, GNCTD, New Delhi (387.7 KiB, 12,584 hits) Decision dated 20.08.2014 - Dr. Srinivas Vyas Vs. Ayurvedic and Unani Tibbia College & Hospital, GNCTD, New Delhi (387.7 KiB, 12,584 hits) Decision dated 20.08.2014 - Ms. Meenud Vyas Vs. Ayurvedic and Unani Tibbia College & Hospital, GNCTD, New Delhi Jal Board, GNCT
Family Welfare (15.8 MiB, 542 hits) CIC Decision dated 23.03.2021 on the Second Appeal/Complaint filed by Shri Venkatesh Nayak Vs. CPIO, Department of Social Justice & Empowerment, New Delhi (138.3 KiB, 712 hits) CIC Decision dated 23.07.2020 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Saurav Das Vs. CPIOs, ICMR, and Ministry of Health & Family
Welfare, New Delhi (277.4 KiB, 1,322 hits) CIC Decision dated 05.06.2020 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Venkatesh Nayak Vs. CPIO, Directorate General of Health & Family Welfare, New Delhi (312.0 KiB, 1,073 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.01.2019 on the Appeal filed by Mr. Kantilal B. Chavda v. CPIO, Central University
Maniram Sharma, Distt. Churu, Rajasthan Vs. Min. of Communication & IT, NIC, New Delhi (525.4 KiB, 11,985 hits) Decision dated 16.01.2015 on Appeal from Sh. Subhash Chandra
 Agrawal Vs. Department for the Welfare of SC/ST/OBC, GNCTD, Delhi (469.0 KiB, 11,120 hits) Decision dated 07.01.2014 - Ms. Jyoti Seherawat Vs. Home (General) Department, Govt. of Delhi (322.2 KiB, 7,394 hits) Decision dated 07.01.2014 - Ms. Jyoti Seherawat Vs. Home (General) Department for the Welfare of SC/ST/OBC, GNCTD, Delhi (469.0 KiB, 11,120 hits) Decision dated 07.01.2014 - Ms. Jyoti Seherawat Vs. Home (General) Department for the Welfare of SC/ST/OBC, GNCTD, Delhi (469.0 KiB, 11,120 hits) Decision dated 07.01.2014 - Ms. Jyoti Seherawat Vs. Home (General) Department for the Welfare of SC/ST/OBC, GNCTD, Delhi (469.0 KiB, 11,120 hits) Decision dated 07.01.2014 - Ms. Jyoti Seherawat Vs. Home (General) Department for the Welfare of SC/ST/OBC, GNCTD, Delhi (469.0 KiB, 11,120 hits) Decision dated 07.01.2014 - Ms. Jyoti Seherawat Vs. Home (General) Department for the Welfare of SC/ST/OBC, GNCTD, Delhi (469.0 KiB, 11,120 hits) Decision dated 07.01.2014 - Ms. Jyoti Seherawat Vs. Home (General) Department for the Welfare of SC/ST/OBC, GNCTD, Delhi (469.0 KiB, 11,120 hits) Decision dated 07.01.2014 - Ms. Jyoti Seherawat Vs. Home (General) Department for the Welfare of SC/ST/OBC, GNCTD, Delhi (469.0 KiB, 11,120 hits) Decision dated 07.01.2014 - Ms. Jyoti Seherawat Vs. Home (General) Department for the Welfare of SC/ST/OBC, GNCTD, Delhi (469.0 KiB, 11,120 hits) Decision dated 07.01.2014 - Ms. Jyoti Seherawat Vs. Home (General) Department for the Welfare of SC/ST/OBC, GNCTD, Delhi (469.0 KiB, 11,120 hits) Decision dated 07.01.2014 - Ms. Jyoti Seherawat Vs. Home (General) Department for the Welfare for the Welfa
hits) Decision dated 30.04.2012 - Ms. Sumaira Abdulali Vs. PIO & Addl. Director, Min. of Environment & Forests, New Delhi (63.7 KiB, 918 hits) Decision dated 12.01.2012 - Shri J.C. Kataria & Shri Mani Ram Sharma Vs. High Courts of AP, Gauhati, Gujarat, HP, Jharkhand, Rajasthan & other High Courts (427.5 KiB, 855 hits) Decision dated
22.09.2011 - Mr. Ankur Goyal, JNU, New Delhi Vs. JS, Min. of Environment & Forests, New Delhi (76.8 KiB, 868 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mr. D.K. Bhaumik, Kolkata Vs. CPIO & GM, SIDBI, Lucknow (68.3 KiB, 1,113 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Shri Rameshwar Lal Bagotia Vs. Rajasthan Drugs & Pharmaceuticals Ltd (A GOI
Enterprise), Jaipur (358.1 KiB, 1,189 hits) — Section 4(1)(a) CIC Decision dated 22.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Mr. Mohit Kumar Gupta Vs. CPIO, University of Delhi (884.2016) and CIC Decision dated 22.04.2020 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Mohit Kumar Gupta Vs. CPIO, University of Delhi (884.2016) and CIC Decision dated 22.04.2020 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Mohit Kumar Gupta Vs. CPIO, University of Delhi (884.2016) and CIC Decision dated 22.04.2020 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Mohit Kumar Gupta Vs. CPIO, University of Delhi (884.2016) and CIC Decision dated 22.04.2020 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Mohit Kumar Gupta Vs. CPIO, University of Delhi (884.2016) and CIC Decision dated 22.04.2020 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Mohit Kumar Gupta Vs. CPIO, University of Delhi (884.2016) and CIC Decision dated 22.04.2020 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Mohit Kumar Gupta Vs. CPIO, University of Delhi (884.2016) and CIC Decision dated 22.04.2020 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Mohit Kumar Gupta Vs. CPIO, University of Delhi (884.2016) and CIC Decision dated 22.04.2020 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Mohit Kumar Gupta Vs. CPIO, University of Delhi (884.2016) and CIC Decision dated 22.04.2020 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Mohit Kumar Gupta Vs. CPIO, University of Delhi (884.2016) and CPIO (884.2016) and C
KiB, 1,258 hits) CIC Decision dated 25.04.2019 on the Appeal filed by D. Sounderraj v. CPIO, Air India, Air Transport Services Ltd., Mumbai (174.4 KiB, 3,802 hits) CIC Decision dated 20.11.2017 on the Complaint filed by Mr.
Shailesh Gandhi Vs. The CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Central Office Building, Mumbai (Full Bench Decision dated 08.08.2017 on the Appeal file by Sh. RK Jain, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, High Court of Madras, Madurai Bench of Madras High Court (358.6 KiB, 7,526 hits) CIC Decision dated 06.02.2017 on Appeal filed
by Shri Gopal Rao Gudi Vs.PIO, National Council of Science Museum (58.4 KiB, 9,078 hits) CIC Decision dated 22.03.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Rameshwar Das Bhankhar Vs. Kendrya Vidyalaya Sansthan, N. Delhi (293.6 KiB, 9,161 hits) CIC Decision dated 12.03.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Hemant Dhage Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of
India, New Delhi (656.2 KiB, 9,851 hits) CIC Decision dated 10.03.2016 on Appeal filed by Nirmal Kanta Vs. Laxmi Bai College, Delhi University (300.9 KiB, 7,233 hits) CIC Decision dated 24.02.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Anil Sood Vs. Sub Divisional Magistrate (Election), Govt. of NCT of Delhi (368.4 KiB, 9,442 hits) Decision dated 31.12.2014 on
complaint from Shri Ashutosh Nagar Vs. National Green Tribunal (474.6 KiB, 925 hits) Decision dated 12.12.2014 - Shri Ram Naresh Vs. Dte. of Education Hqrs., GNCTD, Delhi (450.2 KiB, 10,264 hits) — Section 4(1)(c) CIC Decision dated
02.11.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 06.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Ms. Monika Singh Vs. Family Welfare Deptt., Govt. of NCT of Delhi (291.4 KiB, 9,074 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.10.2015 on Appeal from Mr. David George Thomas Vs. Ministry of Environment &
Forests (264.7 KiB, 7,700 hits) CIC Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Suresh Chander Gupta Vs. Ministry of Environment & Forests, New Delhi (491.9 KiB, 11,239 hits) Decision dated 18.02.2015 on Appeal from Suresh Chander Gupta Vs. Ministry of Environment & Forests, New Delhi (491.9 KiB, 11,239 hits) Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Suresh Chander Gupta Vs. Ministry of Environment & Forests, New Delhi (491.9 KiB, 11,239 hits) Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Suresh Chander Gupta Vs. Ministry of Environment & Forests, New Delhi (491.9 KiB, 11,239 hits) Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Suresh Chander Gupta Vs. Ministry of Environment & Forests, New Delhi (491.9 KiB, 11,239 hits) Decision dated 18.02.2015 on Appeal from Suresh Chander Gupta Vs. Ministry of Environment & Forests, New Delhi (491.9 KiB, 11,239 hits) Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Suresh Chander Gupta Vs. Ministry of Environment & Forests, New Delhi (491.9 KiB, 11,239 hits) Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Suresh Chander Gupta Vs. Ministry of Environment & Forests, New Delhi (491.9 KiB, 11,239 hits) Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Suresh Chander Gupta Vs. Ministry of Environment & Forests, New Delhi (491.9 KiB, 11,239 hits) Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Suresh Chander Gupta Vs. Ministry of Environment & Forests, New Delhi (491.9 KiB, 11,239 hits) Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Suresh Chander Gupta Vs. Ministry of Environment & Forests Chander Chander Gupta Vs. Mini
4(1)(d) CIC Decision dated 02.11.2018 on the Appeal from Mr. David George Thomas Vs. Ministry of Environment & Forests (264.7 KiB, 7,700 hits) CIC Decision dated 20.02.2015 on Appeal from Suresh Chander Gupta Vs. Ministry
"On the basis of the above judgments, the following principles can be clearly gleaned:i) CPIO/PIOs cannot withhold information without reasonable cause;xxx xxxv) PIO/CPIO cannot function merely as "post offices" but instead are responsible to ensure that the information sought under the RTI Act is providedxxx xxxviii) Information cannot be
refused without reasonable cause." [Section 5(3), 5(4), 5(5), 8(1)(d); PIO/CPIO] Delhi HC Judgement dated 22.01.2021 - Sh. Rakesh Kumar Gupta (Erstwhile CPIO) Union Bank of India & Ors. Vs. Central Information Commission & Anr. (889.7 KiB, 1,203 hits) — 5 (4) [download id="11919"] Decision dated 26.02.2015 on Appeal from Shri
Anbuvendhan, Chennai Vs. the CPIO, National Commission for Scheduled Castes, New Delhi (128.6 KiB, 12,387 hits) Decision dated 30.10.2020 on the Second Appeal/Complaint by
Shri Kuldeep Kumar Baranwal v. CPIO, Prime Minister's Office, New Delhi (489.0 KiB, 1,300 hits) CIC Decision dated 12.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v. CPIO Election Commission and Anr. (364.3 KiB, 2,007 hits) CIC Decision dated 12.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v. CPIO Election Commission
of India, New Delhi (666.2 KiB, 4,090 hits) CIC Decision dated 05.04.2017 on the Second Appeal filed by Sucheta Sureshkumar Vs. PIO, EPFO, Mumbai (61.1 KiB, 8,255 hits) Decision dated 05.10.2011 - Mr.
Minz, Ghaziabad Vs. CPIO, All India Radio, Patna (210.0 KiB, 821 hits) — Section 6 (3) - Transfer of Application to Another Public Authority [ CIC Decision dated 23.07.2020 on the Complaint filed by
Mr. Saurav Das Vs. CPIOs, ICMR, and Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, New Delhi (277.4 KiB, 1,322 hits) CIC Decision dated 28.06.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Subhash Chandra
 Agrawal v. CPIO, Min. of Youth Affairs & Sports, New Delhi (321.5 KiB, 5,618 hits) CIC Decision dated 06.08.2018 on the Appeal filed by Ms. Rashi Agrawal Vs. CPIO, Indian Security Press, Nashik (165.0 KiB, 4,822 hits) CIC Decision dated 18.06.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Neeraj Sharma Vs. CPIO, Rajya Sabha
Sectt., New Delhi (55.6 KiB, 5,947 hits) CIC Decision dated 27.12.2016 on Appeal from Sh. Subhash Chandra Agrawal Vs. Department for the Welfare of SC/ST/OBC, GNCTD, Delhi (469.0 KiB, 11,120
 hits) Decision dated 02.01.2015 on Appeal from Shri Subhash Chandra Agarwal Vs. PIO, Dy. Land & Development Officer, Min. of Urban Development, New Delhi (45.4 KiB, 587 hits) Decision dated 04.09.2013 - Shri Paras Nath Singh Vs. Ministry of
Home Affairs (217.6 KiB, 1,022 hits) Decision dated 10.07.2013 - Mr. Perarivalan Vs. Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi (87.2 KiB, 1,730 hits) Decision dated 09.03.2012 - Shri Abhi Ghosh
Kolkata Vs. Air India Ltd., New Delhi (207.7 KiB, 812 hits) Decision dated 05.10.2011 - Mr. L.S.R. Murthy, Hyderabad Vs. PIO&AGM, UCO Bank, Hyderabad Vs. PIO&AGM, UCO Bank, Hyderabad (47.1 KiB, 875 hits) Decision dated 22.09.2011 - Mr. L.C. Sonewane, Bhilai Vs. CPIO & CPIO &
CGM, RBI, Mumbai (103.1 KiB, 779 hits) — Section 7 — CIC Decision dated 20.11.2017 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Shailesh Gandhi Vs. The CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Central Office Building, Mumbai (Full Bench Decision) (697.7 KiB, 7,681 hits) Section 7 — Section 7 — CIC Decision dated 20.11.2016 - Abne Ingty vs. CPIO, Delhi University, New
Delhi (809.4 KiB, 9,806 hits) CIC Decision dated 10.04.2015 on Appeal from Ms. Jyoti Jeena Vs. Institute of Human Behaviour & Allied Sciences, Delhi (525.4 KiB, 11,985 hits) Section 7(1) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav Das Vs. CPIO, Department of Health & Family Welfare (1.9 MiB, 362 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav Das Vs. CPIO, Department of Health & Family Welfare (1.9 MiB, 362 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav Das Vs. CPIO, Department of Health & Family Welfare (1.9 MiB, 362 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav Das Vs. CPIO, Department of Health & Family Welfare (1.9 MiB, 362 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav Das Vs. CPIO, Department of Health & Family Welfare (1.9 MiB, 362 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav Das Vs. CPIO, Department of Health & Family Welfare (1.9 MiB, 362 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav Das Vs. CPIO, Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav Das Vs. CPIO, Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav Das Vs. CPIO, Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav Das Vs. CPIO, Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav Das Vs. CPIO, Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav Das Vs. CPIO, Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav Das Vs. CPIO, Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav Das Vs. CPIO, Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav Das Vs. CPIO, Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav Das Vs. CPIO, Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav Das Vs. CPIO, Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav Das Vs. CPIO, Decisio
dated 22.04.2020 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Mohit Kumar Gupta Vs. CPIO, University of Delhi (884.2 KiB, 1,258 hits) CIC Decision dated 26.04.2019 on the Complaint filed by Monish Gulati v. CPIO, Ministry of Civil Aviation, New Delhi (177.6 KiB, 3,770 hits) CIC Decision dated 20.03.2017 on Second Appeal filed by Amrika Bai V. PIO, EPFO,
  Raipur (84.2 KiB, 8,233 hits) Decision dated 27.09.2013 - Dr. Bijaya Kumar Samantaray Vs. Kolkata Port Trust, Kolkata (202.9 KiB, 1,094 hits) Decision dated 25.06.2012 - Mr. Sanjay Mukund Thatte, Jalgaon Vs. CPIO,
Allahabad Bank, Mumbai (52.2 KiB, 954 hits) — Section 7(3) CIC Decision dated 14.09.2017 on the Appeal filed by Shri R.B. Patil Vs. PIO, Department of Posts (51.8 KiB, 7,902 hits) — Section 7(6) - Providing the information free of cost
 CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Subhash Chandra Agrawal v. CPIO, Min. of Shipping, MMD, Mumbai (60.6 KiB, 4,926 hits) CIC Decision dated 11.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri S.P. Sinha Vs APIO, Min. of Shipping, MMD, Mumbai (60.6 KiB, 4,926 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.12.2015 on Appeal from Mr.
Maniram Sharma, Distt. Churu, Rajasthan Vs. Min. of Communication & IT, NIC, New Delhi (Full Bench Decision dated 13.08.2015 on Appeal from Shri Sunhash Chandra Agrawal Vs. PIO, Min. of Environment, Forests & Climate Change, New Delhi (259.0 KiB, 8,435 hits) Decision dated 27.09.2013 - Dr. Bijaya
Kumar Samantaray Vs. Kolkata Port Trust, Kolkata Port Trust, Kolkata (202.9 KiB, 1,094 hits) Decision dated 26.09.2013 - Shri Amit Bhargava Vs. Ministry of Home Affairs & Bureau of Immigration, IB (242.7 KiB, 1,084 hits) Decision dated 26.09.2013 - Shri Amit Bhargava Vs. Ministry of Home Affairs & Bureau of Immigration, IB (242.7 KiB, 1,084 hits) Decision dated 26.09.2013 - Shri Amit Bhargava Vs. Ministry of Home Affairs & Bureau of Immigration, IB (242.7 KiB, 1,084 hits) Decision dated 26.09.2013 - Shri Amit Bhargava Vs. Ministry of Home Affairs & Bureau of Immigration, IB (242.7 KiB, 1,084 hits) Decision dated 26.09.2013 - Shri Amit Bhargava Vs. Ministry of Home Affairs & Bureau of Immigration, IB (242.7 KiB, 1,084 hits) Decision dated 26.09.2013 - Shri Amit Bhargava Vs. Ministry of Home Affairs & Bureau of Immigration, IB (242.7 KiB, 1,084 hits) Decision dated 26.09.2013 - Shri Amit Bhargava Vs. Ministry of Home Affairs & Bureau of Immigration, IB (242.7 KiB, 1,084 hits) Decision dated 26.09.2013 - Shri Amit Bhargava Vs. Ministry of Home Affairs & Bureau of Immigration, IB (242.7 KiB, 1,084 hits) Decision dated 26.09.2013 - Shri Amit Bhargava Vs. Ministry of Home Affairs & Bureau of Immigration, IB (242.7 KiB, 1,084 hits) Decision dated 26.09.2013 - Shri Amit Bhargava Vs. Ministry of Home Affairs & Bureau of Immigration, IB (242.7 KiB, 1,084 hits) Decision dated 26.09.2013 - Shri Amit Bhargava Vs. Ministry of Home Affairs & Bureau of Immigration, IB (242.7 KiB, 1,084 hits) Decision dated 26.09.2013 - Shri Amit Bhargava Vs. Ministry of Home Affairs & Bureau of Immigration, IB (242.7 KiB, 1,084 hits) Decision dated 26.09.2013 - Shri Amit Bhargava Vs. Ministry of Home Affairs & Bureau of Immigration, IB (242.7 KiB, 1,084 hits) Decision dated 26.09.2013 - Shri Amit Bhargava Vs. Ministry of Home Affairs & Bureau of Immigration Affairs & Bureau of Immigrati
29.12.2011 - Mr. K. Karthirmathiyon, Secy., Coimbatore Consumer Cause, Coimbatore Vs. PIO & JS, Medical Council of India, New Delhi (44.4 KiB, 908 hits) Decision dated 24.11.2011 - Mr. Harinder Dhingra, Gurgaon Vs. Asstt. IG,
Min. of Environment & Forest, New Delhi (90.6 KiB, 808 hits) Decision dated 04.11.2011 - Mr. Rahul Agarwal, Delhi Vs. PIO & AGM, Syndicate Bank, Head Office, Manipal, Karnataka (62.0 KiB, 1,016 hits) Decision dated 04.11.2011 - Mr. Rahul Agarwal, Delhi Vs. PIO & AGM, Syndicate Bank, Head Office, Manipal, Karnataka (62.0 KiB, 1,016 hits) Decision dated 04.11.2011 - Mr. Rahul Agarwal, Delhi Vs. PIO & AGM, Syndicate Bank, Head Office, Manipal, Karnataka (62.0 KiB, 1,016 hits) Decision dated 04.11.2011 - Mr. Rahul Agarwal, Delhi Vs. PIO & AGM, Syndicate Bank, Head Office, Manipal, Karnataka (62.0 KiB, 1,016 hits) Decision dated 04.11.2011 - Mr. Rahul Agarwal, Delhi Vs. PIO & AGM, Syndicate Bank, Head Office, Manipal, Karnataka (62.0 KiB, 1,016 hits) Decision dated 04.11.2011 - Mr. Rahul Agarwal, Delhi Vs. PIO & AGM, Syndicate Bank, Head Office, Manipal, Karnataka (62.0 KiB, 1,016 hits) Decision dated 04.11.2011 - Mr. Rahul Agarwal, Delhi Vs. PIO & AGM, Syndicate Bank, Head Office, Manipal, Karnataka (62.0 KiB, 1,016 hits) Decision dated 04.11.2011 - Mr. Rahul Agarwal, Delhi Vs. PIO & AGM, Syndicate Bank, Head Office, Manipal, Karnataka (62.0 KiB, 1,016 hits) Decision dated 04.11.2011 - Mr. Rahul Agarwal, Delhi Vs. PIO & AGM, Syndicate Bank, Head Office, Manipal, Karnataka (62.0 KiB, 1,016 hits) Decision dated 04.11.2011 - Mr. Rahul Agarwal, Delhi Vs. PIO & AGM, Syndicate Bank, Head Office, Manipal, Karnataka (62.0 KiB, 1,016 hits) Decision dated 04.11.2011 - Mr. Rahul Agarwal, Delhi Vs. PIO & AGM, Syndicate Bank, Head Office, Manipal, Karnataka (62.0 KiB, 1,016 hits) Decision dated 04.11.2011 - Mr. Rahul Agarwal, Delhi Vs. PIO & AGM, Syndicate Bank, Head Office, Manipal, Karnataka (62.0 KiB, 1,016 hits) Decision dated 04.11.2011 - Mr. Rahul Agarwal, Delhi Vs. PIO & AGM, Syndicate Bank, Head Office, Manipal, Mani
04.11.2011 - Mr. G.B. Chandulal, Rajkot Vs. PIO & GM, Dena Bank, Mumbai (39.3 KiB, 868 hits) Decision dated 31.10.2011 - Mr. T. Arumugam, Alwarpet, Chennai Vs. PIO, Min. of Health & Family Welfare, RRIUM, Chennai (48.5 KiB, 852 hits) Decision dated 21.10.2011 - Mr. Nitin Bajaj, Laxmi Nagar, Delhi Vs. CPIO & Asstt. Professor, AIIMS, New
Delhi (48.8 KiB, 975 hits) Decision dated 21.10.2011 - Capt. P.K. Anchal, Bhiwani Vs. CPIO & Chief Manager, Dena Bank, Panchkula (65.4 KiB, 1,029 hits) Decision dated 21.10.2011 on Appeal from Mr. Ashokumar M Pandya, Ahmedabad Vs. PIO & Dy. General Manager, Bank of India, Ahmedabad (55.4 KiB, 977 hits) Decision dated 29.09.2011 - Mr.
G. Ramesh Reddy, Kurnool, AP Vs. CPIO, CGM, NABARD, Hyderabad (47.3 KiB, 779 hits) Decision dated 22.09.2011 - Mr. L.C. Sonewane, Bhilai Vs. CPIO, Ministry of Environment and Forests, New Delhi (197.2 KiB, 698)
hits) Decision dated 06.09.2011 - Mr. A.M. Attar, Mumbai Vs. PIO & GZM, Bank of India, Mumbai (59.3 KiB, 1,166 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mr. Kuldip Raj Kaila, Distt. Hoshiarpur (Punjab) Vs. PIO & Chief Manager, Oriental
Bank of Commerce, Jalandhar (55.9 KiB, 796 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mr. D.K. Bhaumik, Kolkata Vs. CPIO & GM, SIDBI, Lucknow (68.3 KiB, 1,113 hits) Decision dated 04.08.2011 - Mr. Anil Dutt Tyagi, West Sant
Nagar (Burari), Delhi Vs. PIO, Deptt. of Urban Development, New Delhi (44.5 KiB, 810 hits) Decision dated 11.07.2011 - Mr. Krishnanand Tripathi, Sr. Correspondent, Live India, New Delhi Vs. PIO, ESIC, Indore (57.9 KiB, 764 hits) Decision dated 17.07.2011 - Mr. Krishnanand Tripathi, Sr. Correspondent, Live India, New Delhi Vs. PIO, ESIC, Indore (57.9 KiB, 764 hits) Decision dated 17.07.2011 - Mr. Krishnanand Tripathi, Sr. Correspondent, Live India, New Delhi Vs. PIO, ESIC, Indore (57.9 KiB, 764 hits) Decision dated 17.07.2011 - Mr. Krishnanand Tripathi, Sr. Correspondent, Live India, New Delhi Vs. PIO, ESIC, Indore (57.9 KiB, 764 hits) Decision dated 17.07.2011 - Mr. Krishnanand Tripathi, Sr. Correspondent, Live India, New Delhi Vs. PIO, ESIC, Indore (57.9 KiB, 764 hits) Decision dated 17.07.2011 - Mr. Krishnanand Tripathi, Sr. Correspondent, Live India, New Delhi Vs. PIO, ESIC, Indore (57.9 KiB, 764 hits) Decision dated 17.07.2011 - Mr. Krishnanand Tripathi, Sr. Correspondent, Live India, New Delhi Vs. PIO, ESIC, Indore (57.9 KiB, 764 hits) Decision dated 17.07.2011 - Mr. Krishnanand Tripathi, Sr. Correspondent, Live India, New Delhi Vs. PIO, ESIC, Indore (57.9 KiB, 764 hits) Decision dated 17.07.2011 - Mr. Krishnanand Tripathi, Sr. Correspondent, Live India, New Delhi Vs. PIO, ESIC, Indore (57.9 KiB, 764 hits) Decision dated 17.07.2011 - Mr. Krishnanand Tripathi, Sr. Correspondent, Live India, New Delhi Vs. PIO, ESIC, Indore (57.9 KiB, 764 hits) Decision dated 17.07.2011 - Mr. Krishnanand Tripathi, Sr. Correspondent, Live India, New Delhi Vs. PIO, ESIC, Indore (57.9 KiB, 764 hits) Decision dated 17.07.2011 - Mr. Krishnanand Tripathi, Sr. Correspondent, Live India, New Delhi Vs. PIO, ESIC, Indore (57.9 KiB, 764 hits) Decision dated 17.07.2011 - Mr. Krishnanand Tripathi, Sr. Correspondent, Live India, New Delhi Vs. PIO, ESIC, Indore (57.9 KiB, 764 hits) Decision dated 17.07.2011 - Mr. Krishnanand Tripathi, Sr. Correspondent, Live India, New Delhi Vs. PIO, ESIC, Indore (57.9 KiB, 764 hits) Decision dated 17.07.20
(142.5 KiB, 985 hits) — Section 7 (9) - Information to be provided in the form sought unless it would cause disproportional diversion of resources CIC Decision dated 28.12.2020 on the Second Appeals filed by Deeksha Chaudhary Vs. CPIO, Air India Ltd., New Delhi (1.2 MiB, 989 hits) CIC Decision dated 19.03.2020 on the Second Appeals filed by
Ajay Manda Vs. CPIO, Ch. Charan Singh National Institute of Agriculture Marketing, Jaipur (260.7 KiB, 1,359 hits) CIC Decision dated 26.03.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v.
PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.06.2017 on the Second Appeal filed by A.B.S.J. Rao (ESM), Kakinada District, AP Vs. CPIO, NCC Group Hq., Kakinad District, A.P. (54.9 KiB, 8,570 hits) CIC Decision dated 01.09.2016 on Appeal filed by A.B.S.J. Rao (ESM), Kakinada District, AP Vs. CPIO, NCC Group Hq., Kakinada District, A.P. (54.9 KiB, 8,570 hits) CIC Decision dated 01.09.2016 on Appeal filed by A.B.S.J. Rao (ESM), Kakinada District, AP Vs. CPIO, NCC Group Hq., AP Vs. CP
dated 30.04.2015 on Appeal from Surender Vishwakarma Vs. Department of Justice, GOI, New Delhi (248.6 KiB, 11,173 hits) Decision dated 02.03.2015 on Appeal from Dr. Amal Kumar Bhattacharya, Vadodara Vs. Medical Council of India, New Delhi (53.5 KiB, 12,592 hits) Decision dated 08.01.2015 on Complaint from Ms. Sakshi Jain Vs. GGS
Indraprastha University, Delhi (351.0 KiB, 10,934 hits) Decision dated 31.12.2014 on complaint from Shri Ashutosh Nagar Vs. National Green Tribunal (474.6 KiB, 925 hits) Decision dated 03.11.2014 - Shri Jai Prakash Deep Vs. CPIO, India Oil Corporation Ltd., Bhopal (331.9 KiB, 774 hits) Decision dated 03.11.2014 - Shri Jai Prakash Vs. AGM
(HR), DGM (HR) & Ors., Airport Authority of India, Delhi (80.2 KiB, 907 hits) Decision dated 19.02.2014 - Mr. Anand Mohan Vs. Deptt. of Admn. Reforms & PG Grievances (64.1 KiB, 670 hits) Decision dated 15.11.2013 - Shri Sanjiv Chaturvedi Vs. Central
Vigilance Commission, New Delhi (98.7 KiB, 899 hits) Decision dated 15.11.2013 - Harkrishan Das Nijhawan Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation (96.5 KiB, 781 hits) Decision dated 31.08.2012 - Shri Ram Naresh Vs. Ministry of Law &
Justice, Department of Legal Affairs, New Delhi (195.3 KiB, 749 hits) Decision dated 23.12.2011 - Shri Ravi Malpani, Ratlam, M.P. Vs. SSC, New Delhi (204.9 KiB, 764 hits) Decision dated 23.12.2011 - Mr. S.P. Goyal, Mumbai Vs. CPIO, Mumbai DRT No.2, Mumbai DRT No.2, Mumbai (302.0 KiB, 764 hits) Decision dated 23.12.2011 - Mr. S.P. Goyal, Mumbai DRT No.2, Mumbai DRT No.2, Mumbai (302.0 KiB, 764 hits) Decision dated 23.12.2011 - Mr. S.P. Goyal, Mumbai DRT No.2, Mumbai DRT No.2, Mumbai DRT No.2, Mumbai (302.0 KiB, 764 hits) Decision dated 23.12.2011 - Mr. S.P. Goyal, Mumbai DRT No.2, Mumbai DRT No.
Vs. PIO & DGM, Indian Overseas Bank, Chennai (49.1 KiB, 758 hits) Decision dated 16.12.2011 - Smt. Jaylakshmi, Hubli Vs. PIO & DGM, Corporation Bank HO, Mangalore (49.5 KiB, 1,007 hits) Decision dated 12.10.2011 - Mr. K.G.
Krishnamoorthy, Mayiladuthari Vs. PIO, Indian Bank, Chennai (55.4 KiB, 720 hits) Decision dated 16.09.2011 - Smt. Hazra Bee Vs. Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilizers, New Delhi (231.2 KiB, 721 hits) Sections 8 - Exemption from disclosure of information—Section 8(1) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Ch. Rama Krishna Rao Vs. Naval Shipyard, Port
Blair (Full Bench Decision) (223.9 KiB, 1,201 hits) Decision dated 15.06.2012 - Mr. A.K. Pandya, Ahmedabad Vs. CPIO & Dy. Zonal Manager, Bank of India, security/strategic/scientific/economic interests of the State, etc. CIC
Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav Das Vs. CPIO, Department of Health & Family Welfare, New Delhi (277.4 KiB, 1,322 hits) CIC Order dated 03.06.2020 on the
Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das on behalf of the HDFC Bank Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai (160.6 KiB, 1,109 hits) CIC Decision dated 04.01.2017 on the Appeal filed by Mr. Ankur Jindal, Delhi, vs. CPIO, West Central
Railway, Kota, Rajasthan (61.9 KiB, 8,284 hits) CIC Decision dated 28.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Nanik Premchand Rajwani, Distt. Thane Vs CPIO, Union Bank of India, Mumbai (Division Bench Decision) (335.8 KiB, 9,114 hits) CIC Decision dated 28.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Nanik Premchand Rajwani, Distt. Thane Vs CPIO, Union Bank of India, Mumbai (Division Bench Decision) (335.8 KiB, 9,114 hits) CIC Decision dated 28.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Nanik Premchand Rajwani, Distt. Thane Vs CPIO, Union Bank of India, Mumbai (Division Bench Decision) (335.8 KiB, 9,114 hits) CIC Decision dated 28.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Nanik Premchand Rajwani, Distt. Thane Vs CPIO, Union Bank of India, Mumbai (Division Bench Decision) (335.8 KiB, 9,114 hits) CIC Decision dated 28.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Nanik Premchand Rajwani, Distt. Thane Vs CPIO, Union Bank of India, Mumbai (Division Bench Decision) (335.8 KiB, 9,114 hits) CIC Decision dated 28.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Nanik Premchand Rajwani, Distt. Thane Vs CPIO, Union Bank of India, Mumbai (Division Bench Decision) (335.8 KiB, 9,114 hits) CIC Decision dated 28.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Nanik Premchand Rajwani, Distt. Thane Vs CPIO, Union Bank of India, Mumbai (Division Bench Decision) (335.8 KiB, 9,114 hits) CIC Decision dated 28.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Nanik Premchand Rajwani, Division Bench Decision dated 28.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Nanik Premchand Rajwani, Division Bench Decision dated 28.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Nanik Premchand Rajwani, Division Bench Decision dated 28.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Nanik Premchand Rajwani, Division Bench Decision dated 28.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Nanik Premchand Rajwani, Division Bench Decision dated 28.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Nanik Premchand Rajwani, Division Bench Decision dated 28.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Nanik Premchand Rajwani, Division Bench Decision dated 28.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Nanik Premchand Rajwani, Division Bench Decision dated 28.06.
KiB, 8,755 hits) CIC Decision dated 06.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Mr. Onkar Nath, Allahabad Vs. CPIO, Ordnance Factory Board, Kolkata (86.3 KiB, 9,387 hits) CIC Decision dated 26.09.2013 - Shri Amit Bhargava Vs. Ministry
of Home Affairs & Bureau of Immigration, IB (242.7 KiB, 1,087 hits) Decision dated 20.05.2013 - Shri Arun Kumar Aggarwal Vs. PMO / Deptt. of Revenue / Min. of Law (Full Bench Decision) (108.3 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 20.12.2011 - Mr. Subhash Chandra Agrawal, Delhi Vs. PIO & Director (RTI), Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi (53.4)
KiB, 886 hits) Decision dated 04.11.2011 - Mr. V.M. Shirvalkar, Thane Vs. PIO, Reserve Bank of India, Central Office, Mumbai (96.5 KiB, 1,076 hits) — Section 8(1)(b) Decision dated 19.01.2012 - Mr. A.L. Makhijani, President, Forum for Good Governance, Delhi
Vs. CMO, CGHS, New Rajendra Nagar, New Delhi (47.3 KiB, 832 hits) — Section 8(1)(c) — Section 8(1)(d) - Commercial Confidence, Trade Secrets or Intellectual Property CIC Decision dated 25.04.2022 on the Second Appeal filed by Savio J.F. Correia Vs. CPIO, Mormugao Port Trust, Goa (196.5 KiB, 111 hits) CIC Decision dated 22.10.2021 on the
Second Appeal filed by Love Gogia Vs. CPIO, Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd., Office of CGM, Pune (222.5 KiB, 252 hits) — Delhi High Court: "On the basis of the above judgments, the following principles can be clearly gleaned:i) CPIO/PIOs cannot withhold information without reasonable cause;xxx xxxxy) PIO/CPIO cannot function merely as "post
offices" but instead are responsible to ensure that the information sought under the RTI Act is providedxxx xxxviii) Information cannot be refused without reasonable cause." [Section 5(3), 5(4), 5(5), 8(1)(d); PIO/CPIO] Delhi HC Judgement dated 22.01.2021 - Sh. Rakesh Kumar Gupta (Erstwhile CPIO) Union Bank of India & Ors. Vs. Central
Information Commission & Anr. (889.7 KiB, 1,203 hits) --- CIC Decision dated 26.08.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Smt. Meeta Agrawal Vs. CPIO, DGM(G) & Nodal PIO, North Central Railway, RTI Cell, Subedarganj, Allahabad (787.5 KiB, 1,270 hits) CIC Order dated 03.06.2020 on the Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das on behalf of the HDFC
Bank Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai (160.6 KiB, 1,109 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.02.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai
(136.5 KiB, 2,007 hits) CIC Decision dated 09.09.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Vipin Jain v. CPIO, UCO Bank, Indore (150.0 KiB, 2,655 hits) CIC Decision dated 22.05.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Ms. Nutan Thankur vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai (729.1 KiB, 3,459 hits) CIC Decision dated 25.04.2019 on the Appeal filed by D
Sounderraj v. CPIO, Air India, Air Transport Services Ltd., Mumbai (174.4 KiB, 3,802 hits) CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v. CPIO Election Commission of India, New Delhi (666.2 KiB, 4,090 hits) CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Razaak K. Haider v. CPIO, Min. of Youth
Affairs & Sports, New Delhi (321.5 KiB, 5,618 hits) CIC Decision dated 22.06.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh S
Shri Gulab Singh Rana, GM, Indian Overseas Bank, Chennai Vs. CPIO, Indian Overseas Bank, Chennai Vs. CPIO, Indian Overseas Bank, Chennai Vs. CPIO, Petroleum and Natural Gas Regulatory Board, N. Delhi (Div. Bench Decision) (307.1 KiB, 9,130 hits) CIC Decision dated 28.06.2016 on Appeal
filed by Shri Nanik Premchand Rajwani, Distt. Thane Vs CPIO, Union Bank of India, Mumbai (Division Bench Decision) (335.8 KiB, 9,114 hits) CIC Decision dated 06.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Mr. Onkar Nath, Allahabad Vs. CPIO, Ordnance Factory Board, Kolkata (86.3 KiB, 9,387 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.01.2016 - Abne Inqty vs. CPIO, Delhi
University, New Delhi (809.4 KiB, 9,806 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.11.2015 on Appeal from Dr. D. Dhaya Devadas & Shri V. Sundaram Vs. CPIO, Indian Bureau of Mines, Chennai (Full Bench Decision) (648.9 KiB, 7,966 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.11.2015 on Appeal from Dr. D. Dhaya Devadas & Shri V. Sundaram Vs. CPIO, Indian Bureau of Mines, Chennai (Full Bench Decision) (648.9 KiB, 7,966 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.11.2015 on Appeal from Dr. D. Dhaya Devadas & Shri V. Sundaram Vs. CPIO, Indian Bureau of Mines, Chennai (Full Bench Decision) (648.9 KiB, 7,966 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.11.2015 on Appeal from Dr. Dhaya Devadas & Shri V. Sundaram Vs. CPIO, Indian Bureau of Mines, Chennai (Full Bench Decision) (648.9 KiB, 7,966 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.11.2015 on Appeal from Dr. Dhaya Devadas & Shri V. Sundaram Vs. CPIO, Indian Bureau of Mines, Chennai (Full Bench Decision) (648.9 KiB, 7,966 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.11.2015 on Appeal from Dr. Dhaya Devadas & Shri V. Sundaram Vs. CPIO, Indian Bureau of Mines, CPIO,
Janpath, New Delhi (402.8 KiB, 7,867 hits) Decision dated 11.02.2014 - Mr. Ajay Kumar Vs. Central Excise, Guwahati (70.1 KiB, 847 hits) Decision dated 02.08.2013 - Shri Amit Agarwal, Delhi Vs. ITO, Ward 25(1), Range 37, New Delhi
(85.1 KiB, 986 hits) Decision dated 09.10.2012 - Shri Shankar Chandra Das Gupta, Kolkata Vs. IRDA, Hyderabad (443.5 KiB, 856 hits) Decision dated 21.02.2012 - Shri Shankar Chandra Das Gupta, Kolkata Vs. IRDA, Hyderabad (443.5 KiB, 856 hits) Decision dated 21.02.2012 - Shri Shankar Chandra Das Gupta, Kolkata Vs. IRDA, Hyderabad (443.5 KiB, 856 hits) Decision dated 21.02.2012 - Shri Shankar Chandra Das Gupta, Kolkata Vs. IRDA, Hyderabad (443.5 KiB, 856 hits) Decision dated 21.02.2012 - Shri Shankar Chandra Das Gupta, Kolkata Vs. IRDA, Hyderabad (443.5 KiB, 856 hits) Decision dated 21.02.2012 - Shri Shankar Chandra Das Gupta, Kolkata Vs. IRDA, Hyderabad (443.5 KiB, 856 hits) Decision dated 21.02.2012 - Shri Shankar Chandra Das Gupta, Kolkata Vs. IRDA, Hyderabad (443.5 KiB, 856 hits) Decision dated 21.02.2012 - Shri Shankar Chandra Das Gupta, Kolkata Vs. IRDA, Hyderabad (443.5 KiB, 856 hits) Decision dated 21.02.2012 - Shri Shankar Chandra Das Gupta, Kolkata Vs. IRDA, Hyderabad (443.5 KiB, 856 hits) Decision dated 21.02.2012 - Shri Shankar Chandra Das Gupta, Kolkata Vs. IRDA, Hyderabad (443.5 KiB, 856 hits) Decision dated 21.02.2012 - Shri Shankar Chandra Das Gupta, Kolkata Vs. IRDA, Hyderabad (443.5 KiB, 856 hits) Decision dated 21.02.2012 - Shri Shankar Chandra Das Gupta, Kolkata Vs. IRDA, Hyderabad (443.5 KiB, 856 hits) Decision dated 21.02.2012 - Shri Shankar Chandra Das Gupta, Kolkata Vs. IRDA, Hyderabad (443.5 KiB, 856 hits) Decision dated 21.02.2012 - Shri Shankar Chandra Das Gupta, Kolkata Vs. IRDA, Hyderabad (443.5 KiB, 856 hits) Decision dated 21.02.2012 - Shri Shankar Chandra Das Gupta, Kolkata Vs. IRDA, Hyderabad (443.5 KiB, 856 hits) Decision dated 21.02.2012 - Shri Shankar Chandra Das Gupta, Hyderabad (443.5 KiB, 856 hits) Decision dated 21.02.2012 - Shri Shankar Chandra Das Gupta, Hyderabad (443.5 KiB, 856 hits) Decision dated 21.02.2012 - Shri Shankar Chandra Das Gupta, Hyderabad (443.5 KiB, 856 hits) Decision dated 21.02.2012 - Shri Shri Shankar Chandra Das Gupta, Hyderabad (443.5 KiB, 856 hits) De
Mumbai (237.6 KiB, 827 hits) Decision dated 30.01.2012 - Mr. Vinod K. Jose, New Delhi Vs. PIO & DS, Min. of Information & Broadcasting, New Delhi (79.4 KiB, 1,151 hits) Decision dated 19.09.2011 - Mr. H.G. Prabhu, Karkala Vs.
PIO&DGM, Corporation Bank, Mangalore (39.8 KiB, 792 hits)—Section 8(1)(e) - Fiduciary Relationship CIC Decision dated 21.12.2020 on the Second Appeal by Vihar Durve Vs. CPIO, State Bank of India, Mumbai (140.3 KiB, 1,595 hits) CIC Decision dated 11.03.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Ashok Rameshbhai Mistry v. CPIO, Dena Bank, Surat
(130.2 KiB. 4.141 hits) CIC Decision dated 25.04.2018 on the Appeal filed by Ms Seema Jain v. PIO. Department of Posts (99.1 KiB. 3.534 hits) CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Subhash Chandra Agrawal v. CPIO. Min. of Youth Affairs & Sports, New Delhi (321.5 KiB. 5.618 hits) CIC Decision dated 02.11.2018 on the Appeal
filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 19.04.2018 on the Appeal filed by Ashok Pandit Vs. CPIO, State Bank of India, Maheshkhunt, Khagaria, Bihar (62.4 KiB, 6,480 hits) CIC Decision dated
29.12.2016 on the Appeal filed by Shri Pradeep B. Sharma, Indore vs. State Bank of India, Jabalpur/Bhopal (36.9 KiB, 8,793 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Tolendra Kumar Baghmar, Chhattisgarh Vs. CPIO, Dena Bank, Raipur (211.0 KiB, 8,810 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Tolendra Kumar Baghmar, Chhattisgarh Vs. CPIO, Dena Bank, Raipur (211.0 KiB, 8,810 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Tolendra Kumar Baghmar, Chhattisgarh Vs. CPIO, Dena Bank, Raipur (211.0 KiB, 8,810 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Tolendra Kumar Baghmar, Chhattisgarh Vs. CPIO, Dena Bank, Raipur (211.0 KiB, 8,810 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Tolendra Kumar Baghmar, Chhattisgarh Vs. CPIO, Dena Bank, Raipur (211.0 KiB, 8,810 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Tolendra Kumar Baghmar, Chhattisgarh Vs. CPIO, Dena Bank, Raipur (211.0 KiB, 8,810 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Tolendra Kumar Baghmar, Chhattisgarh Vs. CPIO, Dena Bank, Raipur (211.0 KiB, 8,810 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Tolendra Kumar Baghmar, Chhattisgarh Vs. CPIO, Dena Bank, Raipur (211.0 KiB, 8,810 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Tolendra Kumar Baghmar, Chhattisgarh Vs. CPIO, Dena Bank, Raipur (211.0 KiB, 8,810 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Tolendra Kumar Baghmar, Chhattisgarh Vs. CPIO, Dena Bank, Raipur (211.0 KiB, 8,810 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Tolendra Kumar Baghmar, Chhattisgarh Vs. CPIO, Dena Bank, Raipur (211.0 KiB, 8,810 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Tolendra Kumar Baghmar, Chhattisgarh Vs. CPIO, Dena Bank, Raipur (211.0 KiB, 8,810 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Tolendra Kumar Baghmar (211.0 KiB, 8,810 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Tolendra Kumar Baghmar (211.0 KiB, 8,810 hits)
Faridkot, Punjab Vs. CPIOs at Mumbai and Chandigarh, NABARD (219.2 KiB, 8,487 hits) CIC Decision dated 09.06.2016 on Appeal/Complaint filed by Shri Arun Kumar Agarwal, Bangalore Vs. Security & Exchange Board of India (SEBI), Mumbai (Full Bench Decision) (171.2 KiB, 7,101 hits) CIC Decision dated 26.05.2016 on Appeal/Complaint filed by Shri
Gurmeet Singh, Delhi Vs. Safdarjang Hospital & VMMC, New Delhi (85.1 KiB, 9,131 hits) CIC Decision dated 09.12.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.10.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L.
hits) DoPT O.M. dated 22.09.2015 - Draft Extended Select List of 2003 in the UDC Grade-Status regarding passing of typing test(Reminder-VI) (36.5 KiB, 513 hits) CIC Decision dated 13.08.2015 on Appeal from Shri Sunhash Chandra Agrawal Vs. PIO, Min. of Environment, Forests & Climate Change, New Delhi (259.0 KiB, 8,435 hits) Decision dated
17.12.2014 - Mr. Francis Assis Fernandes, Indore Vs. CPIO & Sr. Supdt. of Post Offices, Ujjain (52.4 KiB, 12,606 hits) Decision dated 05.11.2014 - Mr. Inala Satyanarayana Murthy, Machilipatnam, A.P. Vs. CPIO &
```

```
Supdt. of Post Offices, Machilipatnam (50.8 KiB, 710 hits) Decision dated 15.05.2014 - Shri K.P. Singh Vs. U.P.S.C., New Delhi (199.4 KiB, 734 hits) Decision dated 16.01.2014 - Ms. Surekha K.J., Kolkata Vs. Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi (240.6 KiB
758 hits) Decision dated 03.12.2013 - Shri Rajiv Kapur Vs. Delhi Police, South East District, Delhi (213.5 KiB, 921 hits) Decision dated 13.11.2013 - Shri Paras Nath Singh Vs. Ministry of Home Affairs (217.6 KiB, 1,022
hits) Decision dated 06.07.2012 - Mr. Mukesh Agarwal, Chhota Udepur, Distt. Vadodara Vs. PIO&CGM, RBI, Mumbai (95.6 KiB, 1,383 hits) Decision dated 28.05.2012 - Shri Narinder Jain Vs. Delhi, EOW, Crime Branch (194.4 KiB, 936 hits) Decision dated 28.05.2012 - Shri Narinder Jain Vs. Delhi, EOW, Crime Branch (194.4 KiB, 936 hits) Decision dated 28.05.2012 - Shri Narinder Jain Vs. Delhi, EOW, Crime Branch (194.4 KiB, 936 hits) Decision dated 28.05.2012 - Shri Narinder Jain Vs. Delhi, EOW, Crime Branch (194.4 KiB, 936 hits) Decision dated 28.05.2012 - Shri Narinder Jain Vs. Delhi, EOW, Crime Branch (194.4 KiB, 936 hits) Decision dated 28.05.2012 - Shri Narinder Jain Vs. Delhi, EOW, Crime Branch (194.4 KiB, 936 hits) Decision dated 28.05.2012 - Shri Narinder Jain Vs. Delhi, EOW, Crime Branch (194.4 KiB, 936 hits) Decision dated 28.05.2012 - Shri Narinder Jain Vs. Delhi, EOW, Crime Branch (194.4 KiB, 936 hits) Decision dated 28.05.2012 - Shri Narinder Jain Vs. Delhi, EOW, Crime Branch (194.4 KiB, 936 hits) Decision dated 28.05.2012 - Shri Narinder Jain Vs. Delhi, EOW, Crime Branch (194.4 KiB, 936 hits) Decision dated 28.05.2012 - Shri Narinder Jain Vs. Delhi, EOW, Crime Branch (194.4 KiB, 936 hits) Decision dated 28.05.2012 - Shri Narinder Jain Vs. Delhi, EOW, Crime Branch (194.4 KiB, 936 hits) Decision dated 28.05.2012 - Shri Narinder Jain Vs. Delhi, EOW, Crime Branch (194.4 KiB, 936 hits) Decision dated 28.05.2012 - Shri Narinder Jain Vs. Delhi, EOW, Crime Branch (194.4 KiB, 936 hits) Decision dated 28.05.2012 - Shri Narinder Jain Vs. Delhi, EOW, Crime Branch (194.4 KiB, 936 hits) Decision dated 28.05.2012 - Shri Narinder Jain Vs. Delhi, EOW, Crime Branch (194.4 KiB, 936 hits) Decision dated 28.05.2012 - Shri Narinder Jain Vs. Delhi, EOW, Crime Branch (194.4 KiB, 936 hits) Decision dated 28.05.2012 - Shri Narinder Jain Vs. Delhi, EOW, Crime Branch (194.4 KiB, 936 hits) Decision dated 28.05.2012 - Shri Narinder Jain Vs. Delhi, EOW, Crime Branch (194.4 KiB, 936 hits) Decision dated 28.05.2012 - Shri Narinder Jain Vs. 
23.12.2011 - Mr. Yadwinder Singh, Amritsar Vs. PIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Amritsar (57.3 KiB, 854 hits) Decision dated 24.11.2011 - Mr. Sanat Kumar, Vill.+Post Kerma, Distt. Muzaffarpur, Bihar Vs. PIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Amritsar (57.3 KiB, 854 hits) Decision dated 04.11.2011 - Mr. Rahul Agarwal, Delhi Vs. PIO & AGM, Syndicate Bank, Head
Office, Manipal, Karnataka (62.0 KiB, 1,016 hits) Decision dated 04.11.2011 - Mr. V.M. Shirvalkar, Thane Vs. PIO, Reserve Bank of India, Central Office, Mumbai (96.5 KiB, 1,076 hits) Decision dated 21.10.2011 - Mr. Vitin Bajaj, Laxmi Nagar, Delhi Vs. CPIO & Asstt. Professor, AIIMS, New Delhi (48.8 KiB, 975 hits) Decision dated 21.10.2011 on
Appeal from Mr. Ashokumar M Pandya, Ahmedabad Vs. PIO & Dy. General Manager, Bank of India, Ahmedabad (55.4 KiB, 977 hits) Decision dated 29.09.2011 - Mr. G. Ramesh Reddy, Kurnool, AP Vs. CPIO, CGM, NABARD, Hyderabad (47.3 KiB, 826 hits) Decision dated 29.09.2011 - Shri Vikas Patel, Gandhidham Vs. Dy. Estate Manager, Mumbai
Port Trust (rep. through Shri K.L. Sache, Dy. Estate Manager, Mumbai Port Trust) (342.3 KiB, 787 hits) — Section 8(1)(f) CIC Decision dated 09.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Arun Kumar Agarwal, Bangalore Vs. Security &
Exchange Board of India (SEBI), Mumbai (Full Bench Decision) (171.2 KiB, 7,101 hits)—Section 8 (1)(g) CIC Decision dated 12.06.2019 on the Appeal filed by Ujwala Kokde V. CPOI, Ministry of Home Affairs, Judicial Division, New Delhi (718.8 KiB, 3,206 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.01.2019 on the Appeal filed by Mr. Kantilal B. Chavda v.
CPIO, Central University of Gujarat, Gandhinagar, Gujarat (225.6 KiB, 5,023 hits) CIC Decision dated 25.06.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Gulab Singh Rana, GM, Indian Overseas Bank, Chennai Vs. CPIO, Indian Overseas
Bank, Chennai (805.4 KiB, 11,170 hits) CIC Decision dated 09.12.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.10.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.10.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.10.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.10.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.10.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.10.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.10.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.10.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.10.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.10.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.10.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.10.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.10.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.10.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.10.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.10.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.10.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.10.2015 on Appeal from Dr. Alba Agarwal V
Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, New Delhi (352.7 KiB, 737 hits) Decision dated 12.03.2014 - Shri Anil Kumar Jain, Rohini, Delhi-85 (13.4 KiB, 888 hits) Decision dated 09.01.2014 - Smt. Geeta Ghai, Delhi Vs. Dte. General of Lighthouses & Lightships, NOIDA
(197.5 KiB, 828 hits) Decision dated 02.08.2013 - Shri Ram Manohar Vs. Delhi Vs. ITO, Ward 25(1), Range 37, New Delhi (85.1 KiB, 986 hits) Decision dated 14.06.2013 - Shri V.N. Mathur Vs. Delhi Police, South East District (213.0 KiB, 778 hits) Decision dated
Mohinder Singh Sidhu Vs. Dte. Gen. of Vigilance, Customs & Excise, New Delhi (195.6 KiB, 836 hits) Decision dated 06.07.2012 - Mr. Mukesh Agarwal, Chhota Udepur, Distt. Vadodara Vs. PIO&CGM, RBI, Mumbai (95.6 KiB, 836 hits) Decision dated 24.05.2012
Shri D.P. Ojha, DGP (Retd.), Patna Vs. CPIO, CBI, Ranchi (207.6 KiB, 871 hits) Decision dated 07.02.2012 - Shri Rajendra Prasad Gupta Vs. Office of Commissioner of Central Excise & Service Tax, Lucknow (187.1 KiB, 870 hits) Decision dated 07.02.2011 - Capt. P.K. Anchal, Bhiwani Vs. CPIO & Chief Manager, Dena Bank, Panchkula (65.4 KiB, 870 hits) Decision dated 07.02.2012 - Shri Rajendra Prasad Gupta Vs. Office of Commissioner of Central Excise & Service Tax, Lucknow (187.1 KiB, 870 hits) Decision dated 07.02.2012 - Shri Rajendra Prasad Gupta Vs. Office of Commissioner of Central Excise & Service Tax, Lucknow (187.1 KiB, 870 hits) Decision dated 07.02.2012 - Shri Rajendra Prasad Gupta Vs. Office of Commissioner of Central Excise & Service Tax, Lucknow (187.1 KiB, 870 hits) Decision dated 07.02.2012 - Shri Rajendra Prasad Gupta Vs. Office of Commissioner of Central Excise & Service Tax, Lucknow (187.1 KiB, 870 hits) Decision dated 07.02.2012 - Shri Rajendra Prasad Gupta Vs. Office of Commissioner of Central Excise & Service Tax, Lucknow (187.1 KiB, 870 hits) Decision dated 07.02.2012 - Shri Rajendra Prasad Gupta Vs. Office of Commissioner of Central Excise & Service Tax, Lucknow (187.1 KiB, 870 hits) Decision dated 07.02.2012 - Shri Rajendra Prasad Gupta Vs. Office of Commissioner of Central Excise & Service Tax, Lucknow (187.1 KiB, 870 hits) Decision dated 07.02.2012 - Shri Rajendra Prasad Gupta Vs. Office of Commissioner of Central Excise & Service Tax, Lucknow (187.1 KiB, 870 hits) Decision dated 07.02.2012 - Shri Rajendra Prasad Gupta Vs. Office Offi
1,029 hits) — Section 8 (1)(h) - Information impeding the process of investigation or apprehension or prosecution of offenders — Cogent reasons to be given by the public authority as
to how and why the investigation or prosecution will get impaired or hampered by giving the information in question." [Exemption under Sec. 8(1)(h)] Delhi HC Judgement dated 05.02.2021 - Amit Kumar Shrivastava Vs. Central Information Commission, New Delhi (489.9 KiB, 1,011 hits) — CIC Decision dated 06.08.2018 on the Appeal filed by Mr
K.S. Jain Vs. CPIO, Dte. Gen. of Vig., Customs & Central Excise, New Delhi (175.6 KiB, 5,173 hits) CIC Decision dated 12.12.2014 - Shri O.P. Nahar Vs. Department of Legal
05.06.2014 - Mr. S.P. Dogra, Ambala Cantt. Vs. CPIO & Sr. Supdt. of Post Offices, Godhara (63.0 KiB, 6,719 hits) Decision dated 12.05.2014 - Mr. Patel Hasmukhbai Maganbhai, Godhdra Vs. Supdt. of Post Offices, Godhara (63.0 KiB, 6,719 hits) Decision dated 21.05.2014 - Mr. Patel Hasmukhbai Maganbhai, Godhdra Vs. Supdt. of Post Offices, Godhara (63.0 KiB, 6,719 hits) Decision dated 12.05.2014 - Mr. Patel Hasmukhbai Maganbhai, Godhdra Vs. Supdt. of Post Offices, Godhara (63.0 KiB, 6,719 hits) Decision dated 12.05.2014 - Mr. Patel Hasmukhbai Maganbhai, Godhdra Vs. Supdt. of Post Offices, Godhara (63.0 KiB, 6,719 hits) Decision dated 12.05.2014 - Mr. Patel Hasmukhbai Maganbhai, Godhdra Vs. Supdt. of Post Offices, Godhara (63.0 KiB, 6,719 hits) Decision dated 12.05.2014 - Mr. Patel Hasmukhbai Maganbhai, Godhdra Vs. Supdt. of Post Offices, Godhara (63.0 KiB, 6,719 hits) Decision dated 12.05.2014 - Mr. Patel Hasmukhbai Maganbhai, Godhdra Vs. Supdt. of Post Offices, Godhara (63.0 KiB, 6,719 hits) Decision dated 12.05.2014 - Mr. Patel Hasmukhbai Maganbhai, Godhdra Vs. Supdt. of Post Offices, Godhara (63.0 KiB, 6,719 hits) Decision dated 12.05.2014 - Mr. Patel Hasmukhbai Maganbhai, Godhdra Vs. Supdt. of Post Offices, Godhara (63.0 KiB, 6,719 hits) Decision dated 12.05.2014 - Mr. Patel Hasmukhbai Maganbhai, Godhdra Vs. Supdt. of Post Offices, Godhara (63.0 KiB, 6,719 hits) Decision dated 12.05.2014 - Mr. Patel Hasmukhbai Maganbhai Maga
Godhra (64.5 KiB, 639 hits) Decision dated 12.03.2014 - Shri Anil Kumar Jain, Rohini, Delhi-85 (13.4 KiB, 888 hits) Decision dated 27.01.2014 - Mr. Rajan Saluja Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation (59.5 KiB, 894 hits) Decision dated 10.03.2014 - Mr. Rajan Saluja Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation (59.5 KiB, 894 hits) Decision dated 10.03.2014 - Mr. Rajan Saluja Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation (59.5 KiB, 894 hits) Decision dated 10.03.2014 - Mr. Rajan Saluja Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation (59.5 KiB, 894 hits) Decision dated 10.03.2014 - Mr. Rajan Saluja Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation (59.5 KiB, 894 hits) Decision dated 10.03.2014 - Mr. Rajan Saluja Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation (59.5 KiB, 894 hits) Decision dated 10.03.2014 - Mr. Rajan Saluja Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation (59.5 KiB, 894 hits) Decision dated 10.03.2014 - Mr. Rajan Saluja Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation (59.5 KiB, 894 hits) Decision dated 10.03.2014 - Mr. Rajan Saluja Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation (59.5 KiB, 894 hits) Decision dated 10.03.2014 - Mr. Rajan Saluja Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation (59.5 KiB, 894 hits) Decision dated 10.03.2014 - Mr. Rajan Saluja Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation (59.5 KiB, 894 hits) Decision dated 10.03.2014 - Mr. Rajan Saluja Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation (59.5 KiB, 894 hits) Decision dated 10.03.2014 - Mr. Rajan Saluja Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation (59.5 KiB, 894 hits) Decision dated 10.03.2014 - Mr. Rajan Saluja Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation (59.5 KiB, 894 hits) Decision dated 10.03.2014 - Mr. Rajan Saluja Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation (59.5 KiB, 894 hits) Decision dated 10.03.2014 - Mr. Rajan Saluja Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation (59.5 KiB, 894 hits) Decision dated 10.03.2014 - Mr. Rajan Saluja Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation (59.5 KiB, 894 hits) Decision dated 10.03.2014 - Mr. Rajan Saluja Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation (59.5 KiB, 894 hits) Decision dated 10.03.2014 - Mr. Rajan Saluja Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation (59.5 KiB, 89
Ghai, Delhi Vs. Dte. General of Lighthouses & Lightships, NOIDA (197.5 KiB, 828 hits) Decision dated 07.05.2013 - Shri Rednam Deepak, Visakhapatnam Vs. CPIO, Cabinet Sectt., New Delhi (208.5 KiB, 775 hits) Decision dated 12.04.2013 - Shri Rednam Deepak, Visakhapatnam Vs. CPIO, CVC, New Delhi (208.5 KiB, 775 hits) Decision dated 12.04.2013 - Shri Rednam Deepak, Visakhapatnam Vs. CPIO, CVC, New Delhi (208.5 KiB, 775 hits) Decision dated 12.04.2013 - Shri Rednam Deepak, Visakhapatnam Vs. CPIO, CVC, New Delhi (208.5 KiB, 775 hits) Decision dated 12.04.2013 - Shri Rednam Deepak, Visakhapatnam Vs. CPIO, CVC, New Delhi (208.5 KiB, 775 hits) Decision dated 12.04.2013 - Shri Rednam Deepak, Visakhapatnam Vs. CPIO, CVC, New Delhi (208.5 KiB, 775 hits) Decision dated 12.04.2013 - Shri Rednam Deepak, Visakhapatnam Vs. CPIO, CVC, New Delhi (208.5 KiB, 775 hits) Decision dated 12.04.2013 - Shri Rednam Deepak, Visakhapatnam Vs. CPIO, CVC, New Delhi (208.5 KiB, 775 hits) Decision dated 12.04.2013 - Shri Rednam Deepak, Visakhapatnam Vs. CPIO, CVC, New Delhi (208.5 KiB, 775 hits) Decision dated 12.04.2013 - Shri Rednam Deepak, Visakhapatnam Vs. CPIO, CVC, New Delhi (208.5 KiB, 775 hits) Decision dated 12.04.2013 - Shri Rednam Deepak, Visakhapatnam Vs. CPIO, CVC, New Delhi (208.5 KiB, 775 hits) Decision dated 12.04.2013 - Shri Rednam Deepak, Visakhapatnam Vs. CPIO, CVC, New Delhi (208.5 KiB, 775 hits) Decision dated 12.04.2013 - Shri Rednam Deepak, Visakhapatnam Vs. CPIO, CVC, New Delhi (208.5 KiB, 775 hits) Decision dated 12.04.2013 - Shri Rednam Deepak, Visakhapatnam Vs. CPIO, CVC, New Delhi (208.5 KiB, 775 hits) Decision dated 12.04.2013 - Shri Rednam Deepak, Visakhapatnam Vs. CPIO, CVC, New Delhi (208.5 KiB, 775 hits) Decision dated 12.04.2013 - Shri Rednam Deepak, Visakhapatnam Vs. CPIO, CVC, New Delhi (208.5 KiB, 775 hits) Decision dated 12.04.2013 - Shri Rednam Deepak, Visakhapatnam Vs. CPIO, CVC, New Delhi (208.5 KiB, 775 hits) Decision dated 12.04.2013 - Shri Rednam Deepak, Visakhapatnam Vs. CPIO, CVC, New Delhi (208.5 Ki
Rednam Deepak Vs. Ministry of Shipping, New Delhi (194.6 KiB, 792 hits) Decision dated 14.09.2012 - Shri Mohinder Singh Sidhu Vs. Dte. Gen. of Vigilance, Customs & Excise, New Delhi (195.6 KiB, 836 hits) Decision dated 31.07.2012 - Shri K. Thankshinamurthy, Madurai Vs. CPIO, CBI, Chennai (206.7 KiB, 923 hits) Decision dated 31.07.2012 - Shri Mohinder Singh Sidhu Vs. Dte. Gen. of Vigilance, Customs & Excise, New Delhi (195.6 KiB, 836 hits) Decision dated 31.07.2012 - Shri Mohinder Singh Sidhu Vs. Dte. Gen. of Vigilance, Customs & Excise, New Delhi (195.6 KiB, 836 hits) Decision dated 31.07.2012 - Shri Mohinder Singh Sidhu Vs. Dte. Gen. of Vigilance, Customs & Excise, New Delhi (195.6 KiB, 836 hits) Decision dated 31.07.2012 - Shri Mohinder Singh Sidhu Vs. Dte. Gen. of Vigilance, Customs & Excise, New Delhi (195.6 KiB, 836 hits) Decision dated 31.07.2012 - Shri Mohinder Singh Sidhu Vs. Dte. Gen. of Vigilance, Customs & Excise, New Delhi (195.6 KiB, 836 hits) Decision dated 31.07.2012 - Shri Mohinder Singh Sidhu Vs. Dte. Gen. of Vigilance, Customs & Excise, New Delhi (195.6 KiB, 836 hits) Decision dated 31.07.2012 - Shri Mohinder Singh Sidhu Vs. Dte. Gen. of Vigilance, Customs & Excise, New Delhi (195.6 KiB, 836 hits) Decision dated 31.07.2012 - Shri Mohinder Singh Sidhu Vs. Dte. Gen. of Vigilance, Customs & Excise, New Delhi (195.6 KiB, 836 hits) Decision dated 31.07.2012 - Shri Mohinder Singh Sidhu Vs. Dte. Gen. of Vigilance, Customs & Excise, New Delhi (195.6 KiB, 836 hits) Decision dated 31.07.2012 - Shri Mohinder Singh Sidhu Vs. Dte. Gen. of Vigilance, Customs & Excise, New Delhi (195.6 KiB, 836 hits) Decision dated 31.07.2012 - Shri Mohinder Singh Sidhu Vs. Dte. Gen. of Vigilance, Customs & Excise, New Delhi (195.6 KiB, 836 hits) Decision dated 31.07.2012 - Shri Mohinder Singh Sidhu Vs. Dte. Gen. of Vigilance, Customs & Company Sidhu Vs. Dte. Gen. of Vigilance, Customs & Company Sidhu Vs. Dte. Gen. of Vigilance, Customs & Company Sidhu Vs. Dte. Gen. of Vigilance, Customs & Company Sidhu Vs. Dte. Gen. of Vigi
Shri Jagdish Prasad, Ranchi Vs. CPIO, CBI, Ranchi (204.8 KiB, 803 hits) Decision dated 06.07.2012 - Mr. Mukesh Agarwal, Chhota Udepur, Distt. Vadodara Vs. PIO&CGM, RBI, Mumbai (95.6 KiB, 1,383 hits) Decision dated 30.11.2011 on Appeal from Shri Sarpal Singh Vs. National Commission for Cement & Building Materials, Ballabhgarh (192.4)
KiB, 1,110 hits) Decision dated 07.01.2015 on Appeal from Shri S.N. Shukla, Lucknow Vs. Department of Justice, Govt. of India, New Delhi (474.1 KiB, 12,601 hits)—Section 8 (1)(j) - Personal information having no relationship to any public activity or interest or involving invasion on privacy of individual CIC Decision dated 04.08.2022 on the
Second Appeal filed by Prakash Gopalan Vs. Public Information Officer, Office of CPMG, Kerala Circle, Deptt. of Posts, Thiruvananthapuram (507.4 KiB, 38 hits) CIC Decision dated 25.04.2022 on the Second Appeal filed by Savio J.F. Correia Vs. CPIO, Mormugao Port Trust, Goa (196.5 KiB, 111 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.02.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Savio J.F. Correia Vs. CPIO, Mormugao Port Trust, Goa (196.5 KiB, 111 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.02.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Savio J.F. Correia Vs. CPIO, Mormugao Port Trust, Goa (196.5 KiB, 111 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.02.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Savio J.F. Correia Vs. CPIO, Mormugao Port Trust, Goa (196.5 KiB, 111 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.02.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Savio J.F. Correia Vs. CPIO, Mormugao Port Trust, Goa (196.5 KiB, 111 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.02.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Savio J.F. Correia Vs. CPIO, Mormugao Port Trust, Goa (196.5 KiB, 111 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.02.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Savio J.F. Correia Vs. CPIO, Mormugao Port Trust, Goa (196.5 KiB, 111 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.02.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Savio J.F. Correia Vs. CPIO, Mormugao Port Trust, Goa (196.5 KiB, 111 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.02.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Savio J.F. Correia Vs. CPIO, Mormugao Port Trust, Goa (196.5 KiB, 111 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.02.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Savio J.F. Correia Vs. CPIO, Mormugao Port Trust, Goa (196.5 KiB, 111 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.02.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Savio J.F. Correia Vs. CPIO, Mormugao Port Trust, Goa (196.5 KiB, 111 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.02.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Savio J.F. Correia Vs. CPIO, Mormugao Port Trust, Goa (196.5 KiB, 111 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.02.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Savio J.F. Correia Vs. CPIO, Mormugao Port Trust, Goa (196.5 KiB, 111 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.02.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Savio Port Trust, Goa (196.5 KiB, 111 hits) CIC Decision da
 Appeal filed by Jitendra Kumar vs. CPIO, O/o Income Tax Officer, Aligarh, UP (151.8 KiB, 846 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.12.2020 on the Second Appeal by Vihar Durve Vs. CPIO, State Bank of India, Mumbai (140.3 KiB, 1,595 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.12.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Rahmat Bano Vs. Office of Income Tax Officer, Aayakar
 Bhawan, Jodhpur, Rajasthan (157.9 KiB, 1,106 hits) ——- CIC Decision dated 23.02.2022 on the Second Appeal/Complaint filed by Sh. Nagsen Rajaram Suralkar Vs. Department of Posts, Office of Supdt. of Post Office, Bhuswal, Maharashtra (179.9 KiB, 178 hits)Delhi HC Judgment dated 31.08.2020 - Dr. R.S. Gupta Vs. Govt. of NCTD & Ors. - Delhi
High Court: In absence of even a remote connection with any larger public interest, disclosure of information would be exempted as the same would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the individual under section 8(1) (j) of the RTI Act. [Sections 7, 8(1)(j); Attendance Record] Delhi HC Judgment dated 31.08.2020 - Dr. R.S. Gupta Vs. Govt.
of NCTD & Ors. (151.7 KiB, 1,211 hits) —— CIC Decision dated 26.08.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Smt. Basavantamma Vs. CPIO, Office of the
Income Tax Officer, Bengaluru (818.8 KiB, 1,129 hits) CIC Decision dated 24.06.2020 on the Second Appeal by Mr. Rana Ranjan v. CPIO, National Insurance Company Ltd., Bhavnagar
Gujarat (221.4 KiB, 1,658 hits) CIC Decision dated 20.12.2019 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Kripalani M. v. CPIO, Office of Pr. Commissioner of Customs, Menezies Aviation Cargo Terminal, Bangaluru (Full Bench Decision) (257.7 KiB, 1,612 hits) CIC Decision dated 29.11.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Ehtesham Qutubuddin Siddiqui v. CPIO,
Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi (Full Bench Decision) (456.2 KiB, 1,608 hits) CIC Decision dated 07.11.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Vipin Jair.
v. CPIO, UCO Bank, Indore (150.0 KiB, 2,655 hits) CIC Decision dated 25.04.2019 on the Appeal filed by D. Sounderraj v. CPIO, Air India, Air Transport Services Ltd., Mumbai (174.4 KiB, 3,802 hits) CIC Decision dated 26.03.2019 on the Appeal filed by Nutan Thakur v. CPIO, Department of Personnel & Training, New Delhi (164.3 KiB, 4,156).
hits) CIC Decision dated 15.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri R.P. Rohilla v. PIO, Dte. General of Health Services, New Delhi (125.4 KiB, 4,371 hits) CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Subhash Chandra
Agrawal v. CPIO, Min. of Youth Affairs & Sports, New Delhi (321.5 KiB, 5,618 hits) CIC Decision dated 06.08.2018 on the Appeal filed by Mr. K.S. Jain Vs. CPIO, Dte. Gen. of Vig., Customs & Central Excise, New Delhi (175.6 KiB, 5,173 hits) CIC Decision dated 11.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri S.P. Sinha Vs APIO, Min. of Shipping, MMD,
Mumbai (60.6 KiB, 4,926 hits) CIC Decision dated 19.04.2018 on the Appeal filed by Ashok Pandit Vs. CPIO, State Bank of India, Maheshkhunt, Khagaria, Bihar (62.4 KiB, 6,480 hits) CIC Decision dated 19.02.2018 on Appeal filed by Soni S. Eramath Vs. CPIO, Prime Minister's Office, New Delhi (57.2 KiB, 6,645 hits) CIC Decision dated 05.12.2017
on Appeal filed by Madhu Vs. PIO & Sr. DMM, DRM Office, Northern Railway, New Delhi (484.7 KiB, 7,702 hits) CIC Decision dated 04.01.2017 on the Appeal filed by Shri Devraj, Distt. Dharwad, Karnataka vs.
CPIO, South Western Railway, Bangalore (51.4 KiB, 8,977 hits) CIC Decision dated 29.12.2016 on the Appeal filed by Shri Pradeep B. Sharma, Indore vs. State Bank of India, Jabalpur/Bhopal (36.9 KiB, 8,793 hits) CIC Decision dated 17.11.2016 on Appeal filed by Mrs. Gayatri Devi, Distt. Patna, Bihar Vs. CPIO, Office of GM, Personnel Branch,
Vaishali, Bihar (53.5 KiB, 8,861 hits) CIC Decision dated 31.08.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Joginder Singh, Tihar, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendera Place, New Delhi (169.9 KiB, 8,911 hits) CIC Decision dated 22.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Bhramanand Mishra Vs. PIO, Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan, Lucknow (517.0 KiB)
10,069 hits) CIC Decision dated 24.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Ex Nb Sub U.S. Maurya, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, Records Signals (92.3 KiB, 8,755 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Chayan Ghosh Chowdhury, Lucknow Vs. Punjab & Sind Bank, New Delhi (211.9 KiB, 6,875 hits) CIC Decision dated 09.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Chayan Ghosh Chowdhury, Lucknow Vs. Punjab & Sind Bank, New Delhi (211.9 KiB, 6,875 hits) CIC Decision dated 09.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Chayan Ghosh Chowdhury, Lucknow Vs. Punjab & Sind Bank, New Delhi (211.9 KiB, 6,875 hits) CIC Decision dated 09.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Chayan Ghosh Chowdhury, Lucknow Vs. Punjab & Sind Bank, New Delhi (211.9 KiB, 6,875 hits) CIC Decision dated 09.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Chayan Ghosh Chowdhury, Lucknow Vs. Punjab & Sind Bank, New Delhi (211.9 KiB, 6,875 hits) CIC Decision dated 09.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Chayan Ghosh Chowdhury, Lucknow Vs. Punjab & Sind Bank, New Delhi (211.9 KiB, 6,875 hits) CIC Decision dated 09.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Chayan Ghosh Chowdhury, Lucknow Vs. Punjab & Sind Bank, New Delhi (211.9 KiB, 6,875 hits) CIC Decision dated 09.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Chayan Ghosh Chowdhury, Lucknow Vs. Punjab & Sind Bank, New Delhi (211.9 KiB, 6,875 hits) CIC Decision dated 09.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Chayan Ghosh Chowdhury, Lucknow Chowdhury, Lucknow
Bai College, Delhi University (300.9 KiB, 7,233 hits) CIC Decision dated 07.03.2016 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 4,855 hits) CIC Decision dated 07.03.2015 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 4,855 hits) CIC Decision dated 07.03.2016 on Appeal from Shri Durgael from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 07.03.2016 on Appeal from Shri Durgael from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 07.03.2016 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 07.03.2016 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 07.03.2016 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 07.03.2016 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 07.03.2016 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 07.03.2016 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 07.03.2016 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 07.03.2016 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 07.03.2016 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 07.03.2016 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 07.03.2016 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 07.03.2016 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 07.03.2016 on Appeal from Dr. A.L. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 07.03.2016 on Appeal from Dr. Agarwal Vs. Delhi University (280.1 KiB, 10,116 hits) CIC Decision dated 
Prasad Kushwaha, Katni Vs. Life Insurance Corporation of India, Jabalpur (84.4 KiB, 8,142 hits) CIC Decision dated 13.08.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Chandratan, Ahmedabad Vs.
CPIO, Office of Commissioner, Income Tax Department, Surat (89.1 KiB, 8,681 hits) download id="6797"] CIC Decision dated 10.04.2015 on Appeal from Ms. Jyoti Jeena Vs. Institute of Human Behaviour & Allied Sciences, Delhi (525.4 KiB, 11,985 hits) CIC Decision dated 19.03.2015 on Appeal from Dr. Ram Kumar, Jaipur Vs. Controller of
Communication Acts, Deptt. of Telecommunications, Shimla (44.9 KiB, 11,096 hits) CIC Decision dated 03.03.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Baladevan Rangaraju Vs. PIO, Delhi Commission for Women, GNCTD, New Delhi (212.9 KiB, 12,437 hits) Decision dated 21.01.2015 on Appeal from Ms. Harpreet Kaur Vs. Delhi Subordinate Selection Board, Delhi
(454.9 KiB, 12,839 hits) Decision dated 27.01.2015 on Appeal from Mr. M. Mahadevappa Vs. CPIO & DGM (HR/Admn.), BSNL, Mysore (52.6 KiB, 9,469 hits) Decision dated 01.01.2015 on Appeal from Shri Rohit
Sabharwal, President, Coucil of RTI Activists, Ludhiana Vs. CPIO, DGM, BSNL, Ludhiana Vs. CPIO, DGM, BSNL, Ludhiana Vs. CPIO, Sr. Supdt. of Post Offices, Ujjain (52.4 KiB, 12,606 hits) Decision dated 03.11.2014 - Mr. Francis Assis Fernandes, Indore Vs. CPIO, Sr. Supdt. of Post Offices, Ujjain (52.4 KiB, 12,606 hits) Decision dated 03.11.2014 - Mr. Francis Assis Fernandes, Indore Vs. CPIO, DGM, BSNL, Ludhiana Vs. CPIO, DGM,
India, Delhi (80.2 KiB, 907 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Ch. Rama Krishna Rao Vs. Naval Shipyard, Port Blair (Full Bench Decision) (223.9 KiB, 1,201 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Shri Rakesh Gupta Vs. Kendriya Bhandar (216.9 KiB, 823 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Shri Rakesh Gupta Vs. Kendriya Bhandar (216.9 KiB, 823 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Shri Rakesh Gupta Vs. Kendriya Bhandar (216.9 KiB, 823 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Shri Rakesh Gupta Vs. Kendriya Bhandar (216.9 KiB, 823 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Shri Rakesh Gupta Vs. Kendriya Bhandar (216.9 KiB, 823 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Shri Rakesh Gupta Vs. Kendriya Bhandar (216.9 KiB, 823 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Shri Rakesh Gupta Vs. Kendriya Bhandar (216.9 KiB, 823 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Shri Rakesh Gupta Vs. Kendriya Bhandar (216.9 KiB, 823 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Shri Rakesh Gupta Vs. Kendriya Bhandar (216.9 KiB, 825 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Shri Rakesh Gupta Vs. Kendriya Bhandar (216.9 KiB, 825 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Shri Rakesh Gupta Vs. Kendriya Bhandar (216.9 KiB, 825 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Shri Rakesh Gupta Vs. Kendriya Bhandar (216.9 KiB, 825 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Shri Rakesh Gupta Vs. Kendriya Bhandar (216.9 KiB, 825 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Shri Rakesh Gupta Vs. Kendriya Bhandar (216.9 KiB, 825 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Shri Rakesh Gupta Vs. Kendriya Bhandar (216.9 KiB, 825 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Shri Rakesh Gupta Vs. Kendriya Bhandar (216.9 KiB, 825 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Shri Rakesh Gupta Vs. Kendriya Bhandar (216.9 KiB, 825 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Shri Rakesh Gupta Vs. Kendriya Bhandar (216.9 KiB, 825 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Shri Rakesh Gupta Vs. Kendriya Bhandar (216.9 KiB, 825 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Shri Rakesh Gupta Vs. Kendriya Bhandar (216.9 KiB, 825 hits) Decision dated 05.05.2014 - Shri Rakesh Gupta Vs. Kendriya Bhandar (216.9 KiB, 825 hits) Decision dated 05
hits) Decision dated 03.04.2014 - Sh. Arun Kumar Sinha, Kolkata Vs. CPIO, National Library, Govt. of India, Kolkata (310.4 KiB, 963 hits) Decision dated 12.03.2014 - Shr. Ajay Kumar Vs. Central Excise, Guwahati (70.1 KiB, 847 hits) Decision dated 27.01.2014
Shri Girish Nautiyal Vs. Indian Oil Corporation Ltd., NOIDA (200.5 KiB, 1,128 hits) Decision dated 03.12.2013 - Shri Rajiv Kapur Vs. Delhi Police, South East District, Delhi (213.5 KiB, 921 hits) Decision dated 13.11.2013 - Shri Rajiv Kapur Vs. Delhi Police, South East District, Delhi (213.5 KiB, 921 hits) Decision dated 13.11.2013 - Shri Rajiv Kapur Vs. Delhi Police, South East District, Delhi (213.5 KiB, 921 hits) Decision dated 13.11.2013 - Shri Rajiv Kapur Vs. Delhi Police, South East District, Delhi (213.5 KiB, 921 hits) Decision dated 13.11.2013 - Shri Rajiv Kapur Vs. Delhi Police, South East District, Delhi (213.5 KiB, 921 hits) Decision dated 13.11.2013 - Shri Rajiv Kapur Vs. Delhi Police, South East District, Delhi (213.5 KiB, 921 hits) Decision dated 13.11.2013 - Shri Rajiv Kapur Vs. Delhi Police, South East District, Delhi (213.5 KiB, 921 hits) Decision dated 13.11.2013 - Shri Rajiv Kapur Vs. Delhi Police, South East District, Delhi (213.5 KiB, 921 hits) Decision dated 13.11.2013 - Shri Rajiv Kapur Vs. Delhi Police, South East District, Delhi (213.5 KiB, 921 hits) Decision dated 13.11.2013 - Shri Rajiv Kapur Vs. Delhi Police, South East District, Delhi (213.5 KiB, 921 hits) Decision dated 13.11.2013 - Shri Rajiv Kapur Vs. Delhi Police, South East District, Delhi (213.5 KiB, 921 hits) Decision dated 13.11.2013 - Shri Rajiv Kapur Vs. Delhi Police, South East District, Delhi (213.5 KiB, 921 hits) Decision dated 13.11.2013 - Shri Rajiv Kapur Vs. Delhi Police, South East District, Delhi (213.5 KiB, 921 hits) Decision dated 13.11.2013 - Shri Rajiv Kapur Vs. Delhi Police, South East District, Delhi (213.5 KiB, 921 hits) Decision dated 13.11.2013 - Shri Rajiv Kapur Vs. Delhi Police, South East District, Delhi (213.5 KiB, 921 hits) Decision dated 13.11.2013 - Shri Rajiv Kapur Vs. Delhi Police, South East District, Delhi (213.5 KiB, 921 hits) Decision dated 13.11.2013 - Shri Rajiv Kapur Vs. Delhi Police, Delhi Pol
Shri Chandran Nair, Ahmedabad Vs. DCIT (Vig.) & Addl. CIT, Ahmedabad (242.9 KiB, 845 hits) Decision dated 07.11.2013 - Smt. Tapati Bhattacharjee Vs. Office of Dy. Conservator of Forests, Port Blair (95.7 KiB, 805 hits) Decision dated
17.09.2013 - Shri Amanullah Khan, Pune Vs. Tax Recovery Officer & AO, Pune (240.1 KiB, 1,553 hits) Decision dated 22.07.2013 - Shri Vishwas
 Bharmburkar, Ahmedabad Vs. CPIO, Cabinet Secretariat, New Delhi (208.8 KiB, 816 hits) Decision dated 11.07.2013 - Shri Ram Manohar Vs. Delhi Vs. CPIO, Cabinet Sectt., New Delhi (211.0 KiB, 923 hits) Decision dated 26.06.2013 - Shri Rednam
Deepak, Visakhapatnam Vs. CPIO, Cabinet Sectt., New Delhi (212.1 KiB, 856 hits) Decision dated 21.03.2013 - Shri R.A. Gupta, Sr. Manager, Pallavan Grama
Bank, Irudhukottai, Tamilnadu Vs. PIO & GM, Pallavan Grama Bank, Salem, Tamilnadu (62.5 KiB, 797 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2012 - Mrs. Anita Singh, Galjwadi, Gadi Cant., Dehradun Vs. PIO, Passport Office, Bareilly (UP) (76.9 KiB, 983)
hits) Decision dated 04.04.2012 - Shri Prafulla Jojo Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, New Delhi (194.3 KiB, 1,119 hits) Decision dated 30.01.2012 - Mr. Vinod K. Jose, New Delhi Vs. PIO & DS, Min. of Information & Broadcasting, New Delhi (79.4 KiB, 1,151 hits) Decision dated 16.12.2011 - Smt. Jaylakshmi, Hubli Vs. PIO & DGM, Corporation Bank
HO, Mangalore (49.5 KiB, 1,007 hits) Decision dated 16.12.2011 - Mr. Sukhjit Singh Walia, Patiala Vs. PIO, United Bank of India, Kolkata (63.3 KiB, 894 hits) Decision dated 24.11.2011 - Mr. Sanat Kumar, Vill.+Post Kerma, Distt. Muzaffarpur, Bihar Vs. PIO, United Bank of India, Kolkata (63.3 KiB, 894 hits) Decision dated
04.11.2011 - Mr. D.S. Jolly, Motia Khan, New Delhi Vs. PIO & Chief Manager, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendra Place, New Delhi (59.1 KiB, 944 hits) Decision dated 21.10.2011 on Appeal from Mr. Ashokumar M Pandya, Ahmedabad Vs. PIO & Dy. General Manager, Bank of India, Ahmedabad (55.4 KiB, 977 hits) Decision dated 21.10.2011 on Appeal
from Ms. Bimla Prakash, Delhi Vs. CPIO & DGM, Indian Overseas Bank, Central Office, Chennai (59.6 KiB, 1,110 hits) Decision dated 21.10.2011 - Sh. D.K. Pandey, Jamshedpur Vs. PIO, Passport Office, Ranchi (62.6 KiB, 895 hits)—Section 8(2) - Public interest in disclosure outweighing harm to the protected interests CIC Decision dated 25.04.2018
on the Appeal filed by Ms Seema Jain v. PIO, Department of Posts (99.1 KiB, 3,534 hits) CIC Decision dated 08.11.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT
(523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 12.03.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Hemant Dhage Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (656.2 KiB, 9,851 hits) CIC Decision dated 13.08.2015 on Appeal from Shri Sunhash Chandra Agrawal Vs. PIO, Min. of Environment, Forests & Climate Change, New Delhi (259.0 KiB, 8,435)
hits) Decision dated 03.11.2014 - Shri Chander Prakash Vs. AGM (HR), DGM (HR) & Ors., Airport Authority of India, Delhi (80.2 KiB, 907 hits) Decision dated 01.06.2012 - Mr. Vipan Kumar Gupta, Ludhiana Vs. CPIO & DGM, Andhra Bank, Zonal
29.11.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Ehtesham Qutubuddin Siddiqui v. CPIO, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi (Full Bench Decision) (456.2 KiB, 1,608 hits) CIC Decision dated 08.02.2016 on Appeal filed by Mr. Hemant Kumar Agarwal, Sarguja, Chhattisgarh Vs. CPIO & Supdt. of Post Office, Raigad (55.0 KiB, 9,516 hits) — Section 8
(Uncategorized) Delhi HC Judgment dated 16.01.2019 - Entisham Qutubuddin Siddique v. CPIO Intelligence Bureau (370.6 KiB, 4,817 hits) CIC Decision dated 07.05.2018 on the Appeal/Complaint filed by Mr. M. Dinesh Vs. PIO, Bureau of Immigration, IB (MHA) (362.6 KiB, 4,922 hits) Decision dated 30.01.2015 on Appeal from Shri N.B. Deshmukh
Thane Vs. CPIO Air India Ltd., Mumbai (42.1 KiB, 12,499 hits) Decision dated 09.03.2012 - Shri Ankur Mutreja, New Delhi (213.3 KiB, 713 hits) Decision dated 06.09.2011 - Mr.
Deepak Bhalla, Paharganj, New Delhi Vs. PIO, Embassy of India, The Netherlands and DS (RTI), Min. of External Affairs, New Delhi (187.1 KiB, 785 hits) Decision dated 01.09.2011 - Smt. Neena, Chandigarh Vs. CPIO, Canara Bank, New
Delhi (205.9 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 06.09.2011 - Mrs. Mary V. Abraham, Engg. College, Thiruvananthapuram Vs. PIO & Director, ISRO, Bangalore (62.7 KiB, 699 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mr. Manish Bhatnagar, Delhi (205.9 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 06.09.2011 - Mrs. Mary V. Abraham, Engg. College, Thiruvananthapuram Vs. PIO & Director, ISRO, Bangalore (62.7 KiB, 699 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mrs. Manish Bhatnagar, Delhi (205.9 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mrs. Mary V. Abraham, Engg. College, Thiruvananthapuram Vs. PIO & Director, ISRO, Bangalore (62.7 KiB, 699 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mrs. Manish Bhatnagar, Delhi (205.9 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mrs. Manish Bhatnagar, Delhi (205.9 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mrs. Manish Bhatnagar, Delhi (205.9 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mrs. Manish Bhatnagar, Delhi (205.9 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mrs. Manish Bhatnagar, Delhi (205.9 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mrs. Manish Bhatnagar, Delhi (205.9 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mrs. Manish Bhatnagar, Delhi (205.9 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mrs. Manish Bhatnagar, Delhi (205.9 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mrs. Manish Bhatnagar, Delhi (205.9 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mrs. Manish Bhatnagar, Delhi (205.9 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mrs. Manish Bhatnagar, Delhi (205.9 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mrs. Manish Bhatnagar, Delhi (205.9 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mrs. Manish Bhatnagar, Delhi (205.9 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mrs. Manish Bhatnagar, Delhi (205.9 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mrs. Manish Bhatnagar, Delhi (205.9 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mrs. Manish Bhatnagar, Delhi (205.9 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mrs. Manish Bhatnagar, Delhi (205.9 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mrs. Manish Bhatnagar, Delhi (205.9 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 2
Vs. SPIO & Addl. Director, Deptt of Woman & Child Development, NCT of Delhi (Full Bench Decision) (92.7 KiB, 1,066 hits) Decision dated 04.08.2011 - Mr. Anil Dutt Tyagi, West Sant Nagar (Burari), Delhi Vs. PIO, Deptt. of Urban Development, New Delhi (44.5 KiB, 810 hits) Decision dated 04.08.2011 - Shri R.K. Jain Vs. CBEC, New Delhi (352.9
KiB, 886 hits) Decision dated 04.08.2011 - Shri Rameshwar Lal Bagotia Vs. Rajasthan Drugs & Pharmaceuticals Ltd (A GOI Enterprise), Jaipur (358.1 KiB, 1,189 hits) Decision dated 11.07.2011 - Mr. Mahinder Singh, AD, ESIC, New Delhi Vs. PIO, ESIC, Indore (57.9 KiB, 764 hits) Section 9 - Grounds for rejection to access in certain cases Decision
dated 30.01.2012 - Mr. Vinod K. Jose, New Delhi Vs. PIO & DS, Min. of Information & Broadcasting, New Delhi (79.4 KiB, 1,151 hits) Section 10 - Severability — Severabilit
06.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Mr. Onkar Nath, Allahabad Vs. CPIO, Ordnance Factory Board, Kolkata (86.3 KiB, 9,387 hits) CIC Decision dated 31.03.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Maniram Sharma, Distt. Churu, Rajasthan Vs. Min. of Communication & IT, NIC, New Delhi (Full Bench Decision) (534.3 KiB, 9,575 hits) CIC Decision dated 31.03.2015 on
Appeal from Shri Shantaram Vs. New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Mumbai (136.5 KiB, 11,149 hits) CIC Decision dated 03.03.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Baladevan Rangaraju Vs. PIO, Delhi Commission for Women, GNCTD, New Delhi (212.9 KiB, 12,437 hits) Decision dated 02.03.2015 on Appeal from Dr. Amal Kumar Bhattacharya, Vadodara Vs. Medical
Council of India, New Delhi (53.5 KiB, 12,592 hits) — Section dated 02.02.2015 on Appeal from Dr. Satya Prakash, Delhi Vs. Lalit Kala Akademi, New Delhi (207.4 KiB, 12,592 hits) — Section 10(1) CIC Decision dated 07.11.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Rakesh Sharma Vs. Asstt. Secretary & CPIO, Central Board of Secondary Education,
Regional Office, Allahabad (520.3 KiB, 2,262 hits) CIC Decision dated 02.11.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Ajay Kumar, Gurgaon Vs. National Institute of Technology, Patna (32.3 KiB, 7,465 hits) Decision dated 27.01.2014 - Mr.
Kaushal Vs. Delhi Police, East District (71.0 KiB, 1,022 hits) Decision dated 15.03.2013 - Shri Ravinder Singh Neqi Vs. New India Assurance Co. (90.4 KiB, 918 hits) Decision dated 06.07.2012 - Mr. Mukesh Agarwal, Chhota Udepur, Distt. Vadodara Vs.
PIO&CGM, RBI, Mumbai (95.6 KiB, 1,383 hits) Decision dated 07.02.2012 - Shri Rajendra Prasad Gupta Vs. Office of Commissioner of Central Excise & Service Tax, Lucknow (187.1 KiB, 870 hits) — Section 10(2) Decision dated 09.01.2014 - Smt. Geeta Ghai, Delhi Vs. Dte. General of Lighthouses & Lightships, NOIDA (197.5 KiB, 828 hits) Decision dated 09.01.2014 - Smt. Geeta Ghai, Delhi Vs. Dte. General of Lighthouses & Lightships, NOIDA (197.5 KiB, 828 hits) Decision dated 09.01.2014 - Smt. Geeta Ghai, Delhi Vs. Dte. General of Lighthouses & Lightships, NOIDA (197.5 KiB, 828 hits) Decision dated 09.01.2014 - Smt. Geeta Ghai, Delhi Vs. Dte. General of Lighthouses & Lightships, NOIDA (197.5 KiB, 828 hits) Decision dated 09.01.2014 - Smt. Geeta Ghai, Delhi Vs. Dte. General of Lighthouses & Lightships, NOIDA (197.5 KiB, 828 hits) Decision dated 09.01.2014 - Smt. Geeta Ghai, Delhi Vs. Dte. General of Lighthouses & Lightships, NOIDA (197.5 KiB, 828 hits) Decision dated 09.01.2014 - Smt. Geeta Ghai, Delhi Vs. Dte. General of Lighthouses & Lightships, NOIDA (197.5 KiB, 828 hits) Decision dated 09.01.2014 - Smt. General of Lighthouses & Lightships, NOIDA (197.5 KiB, 828 hits) Decision dated 09.01.2014 - Smt. General of Lighthouses & Lightships, NOIDA (197.5 KiB, 828 hits) Decision dated 09.01.2014 - Smt. General of Lighthouses & Lightships, NOIDA (197.5 KiB, 828 hits) Decision dated 09.01.2014 - Smt. General of Lighthouses & Lightships, NOIDA (197.5 KiB, 828 hits) Decision dated 09.01.2014 - Smt. General of Lighthouses & Lightships, NOIDA (197.5 KiB, 828 hits) Decision dated 09.01.2014 - Smt. General of Lighthouses & Lightships, NOIDA (197.5 KiB, 828 hits) Decision dated 09.01.2014 - Smt. General of Lighthouses & Lightships, NOIDA (197.5 KiB, 828 hits) Decision dated 09.01.2014 - Smt. General of Lighthouses & Lightships, NOIDA (197.5 KiB, 828 hits) Decision dated 09.01.2014 - Smt. General of Lighthouses & Lightships (197.5 KiB, 828 hits) Decision dated 09.01.2014 - Smt. General of Lighthouses & Lightships (197.5 KiB, 828 hits) 
dated 26.09.2013 - Shri Amit Bhargava Vs. Ministry of Home Affairs & Bureau of Immigration, IB (242.7 KiB, 1,087 hits) Decision dated 27.12.2011 - Mr. Subhash Chandra Agrawal, Delhi Vs. PIO &
Director (RTI), Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi (53.4 KiB, 886 hits) Decision dated 06.09.2011 - Mrs. Mary V. Abraham, Engq. College, Thiruvananthapuram Vs. PIO & Director, ISRO, Bangalore (62.7 KiB, 699 hits) Decision dated 06.09.2011 - Mrs. Mary V. Abraham, Engq. College, Thiruvananthapuram Vs. PIO & Director, ISRO, Bangalore (62.7 KiB, 699 hits) Decision dated 06.09.2011 - Mrs. Mary V. Abraham, Engq. College, Thiruvananthapuram Vs. PIO & Director, ISRO, Bangalore (62.7 KiB, 699 hits) Decision dated 06.09.2011 - Mrs. Mary V. Abraham, Engq. College, Thiruvananthapuram Vs. PIO & Director, ISRO, Bangalore (62.7 KiB, 699 hits) Decision dated 06.09.2011 - Mrs. Mary V. Abraham, Engq. College, Thiruvananthapuram Vs. PIO & Director, ISRO, Bangalore (62.7 KiB, 699 hits) Decision dated 06.09.2011 - Mrs. Mary V. Abraham, Engq. College, Thiruvananthapuram Vs. PIO & Director, ISRO, Bangalore (62.7 KiB, 699 hits) Decision dated 06.09.2011 - Mrs. Mary V. Abraham, Engq. College, Thiruvananthapuram Vs. PIO & Director, ISRO, Bangalore (62.7 KiB, 699 hits) Decision dated 06.09.2011 - Mrs. Mary V. Abraham, Engq. College, Thiruvananthapuram Vs. PIO & Director, ISRO, Bangalore (62.7 KiB, 699 hits) Decision dated 06.09.2011 - Mrs. Mary V. Abraham, Engq. College, Thiruvananthapuram Vs. PIO & Director, ISRO, Bangalore (62.7 KiB, 699 hits) Decision dated 06.09.2011 - Mrs. Mary V. Abraham, Engq. College, Thiruvananthapuram Vs. PIO & Director, ISRO, Bangalore (62.7 KiB, 699 hits) Decision dated 06.09.2011 - Mrs. Mary V. Abraham, Engq. College, Thiruvananthapuram Vs. PIO & Director, ISRO, Bangalore (62.7 KiB, 699 hits) Decision dated 06.09.2011 - Mrs. Mary V. Abraham, Engq. College, Thiruvananthapuram Vs. PIO & Director, ISRO, Bangalore (62.7 KiB, 699 hits) Decision dated 06.09.2011 - Mrs. Mary V. Abraham, Engq. College, Thiruvananthapuram Vs. PIO & Director, ISRO, Bangalore (62.7 KiB, 699 hits) Decision dated 06.09.2011 - Mrs. Mary V. Abraham, Engq. College, Thiruvananthapuram Vs. PIO & Director, ISRO, Bangalore (62.7 KiB, 699 h
 (57.0 KiB, 778 hits)Section 11 - Third Party Information CIC Decision dated 15.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri R.P. Rohilla v. PIO, Dte. General of Health Services, New Delhi (125.4 KiB, 4,371 hits) CIC Decision dated 11.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri S.P. Sinha Vs APIO, Min. of Shipping, MMD, Mumbai (60.6 KiB, 4,926 hits) Delhi HC
  Bank, Raipur (211.0 KiB, 8,810 hits) CIC Decision dated 11.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Vivek Duggal Vs. CPIO, Petroleum and Natural Gas Regulatory Board, N. Delhi (Div. Bench Decision) (307.1 KiB, 9,130 hits) CIC Decision dated 26.05.2016 on Appeal/Complaint filed by Shri Gurmeet Singh, Delhi Vs. Safdarjang Hospital & VMMC, New Delhi (Div. Bench Decision) (307.1 KiB, 9,130 hits) CIC Decision dated 26.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gurmeet Singh, Delhi Vs. Safdarjang Hospital & VMMC, New Delhi (Div. Bench Decision) (307.1 KiB, 9,130 hits) CIC Decision dated 26.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gurmeet Singh, Delhi Vs. Safdarjang Hospital & VMMC, New Delhi (Div. Bench Decision) (307.1 KiB, 9,130 hits) CIC Decision dated 26.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gurmeet Singh, Delhi Vs. Safdarjang Hospital & VMMC, New Delhi (Div. Bench Decision) (307.1 KiB, 9,130 hits) CIC Decision dated 26.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gurmeet Singh, Delhi Vs. Safdarjang Hospital & VMMC, New Delhi (Div. Bench Decision) (307.1 KiB, 9,130 hits) CIC Decision dated 26.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gurmeet Singh, Delhi Vs. Safdarjang Hospital & VMMC, New Delhi (Div. Bench Decision) (307.1 KiB, 9,130 hits) CIC Decision dated 26.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gurmeet Singh, Delhi Vs. Safdarjang Hospital & VMMC, New Delhi (Div. Bench Decision) (307.1 KiB, 9,130 hits) CIC Decision dated 26.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gurmeet Singh, Delhi Vs. Safdarjang Hospital & VMMC, New Delhi (Div. Bench Decision) (307.1 KiB, 9,130 hits) CIC Decision dated 26.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gurmeet Singh, Delhi (Div. Bench Decision) (307.1 KiB, 9,130 hits) CIC Decision dated 26.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gurmeet Singh, Delhi (Div. Bench Decision) (307.1 KiB, 9,130 hits) CIC Decision dated 26.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gurmeet Singh, Delhi (Div. Bench Decision) (307.1 KiB, 9,130 hits) CIC Decision dated 26.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gurmeet Singh, Delhi (Div. Bench Decision) (307.1 KiB, 9,130 hits) CIC Decision dated 26.05.2016 on Ap
(85.1 KiB, 9,131 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.12.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Maniram Sharma, Distt. Churu, Rajasthan Vs. Min. of Communication & IT, NIC, New Delhi (Full Bench Decision) (534.3 KiB, 9,575 hits) CIC Decision dated 10.04.2015 on Appeal from Ms. Jyoti Jeena Vs. Institute of Human Behaviour & Allied Sciences, Delhi (525.4 KiB, 11,985).
Decision) (223.9 KiB, 1,201 hits) Decision dated 15.05.2014 - Shri Anil Kumar Khabya, Bhopal Vs. DCIT, Bhopal (13.4 KiB, 829 hits) Decision dated 17.02.2014 - Shri Gaikwad Shahurao Vishwanthrao, Parbhani, Maharashtra Vs. CPIO, Maharashtra Gramin Bank, Nanded, Maharashtra (210.2 KiB, 756 hits) Decision dated 17.02.2014 - Shri Gaikwad Shahurao Vishwanthrao, Parbhani, Maharashtra Vs. CPIO, Maharashtra Gramin Bank, Nanded, Maharashtra (210.2 KiB, 756 hits) Decision dated 17.02.2014 - Shri Gaikwad Shahurao Vishwanthrao, Parbhani, Maharashtra Vs. CPIO, Maharashtra Us. CPI
of India, Mumbai (91.3 KiB, 679 hits) Decision dated 20.05.2013 - Shri Vinod Kumar Sharma Vs. Ministry of Mines, New Delhi (Full Bench Decision dated 21.05.2012 - Mrs. Anita Singh, Galjwadi, Gadi Cant., Dehradun Vs. PIO, Passport Office, Bareilly (UP) (76.9 KiB, 983 hits) Decision dated 22.02.2012 - Shri S.P. Goyal
Bank of India, Mumbai (136.5 KiB, 2,007 hits) Section 18 - Powers and Functions of Information Commissions CIC Decision dated 06.05.2016 on Complaint filed by Shri S.C. Agrawal Vs. Constitution Club of India (Full Bench Decision) (252.0 KiB, 8,872 hits) CIC Decision dated 15.01.2016 - Abne Ingty vs. CPIO, Delhi University, New Delhi (809.4)
KiB, 9,806 hits) Decision dated 05.02.2015 on Complaint from Shri Pradeep Sharma Vs. Social Welfare Officer (respondent) (350.5 KiB, 12,489 hits) Decision dated 03.02.2015 on Complaint from Shri Ram Naresh Vs. Dte. of Education
hits) Decision dated 28.09.2012 - Shri Shiv Shankar Tiwari, Faridabad Vs. DOPT, New Delhi (331.0 KiB, 721 hits) Decision dated 30.04.2012 - Shri Shiv Shankar Tiwari, Faridabad Vs. PIO & Addl. Director, Min. of
Environment & Forests, New Delhi (63.7 KiB, 918 hits) Decision dated 06.03.2012 - Shri N. Srinivas, Hyderabad Vs. CPIO, Staff Selection Commission, Chennai (298.2 KiB, 754 hits) Decision dated 12.01.2012 - Shri J.C. Kataria & Shri Mani Ram Sharma Vs. High Courts of AP, Gauhati, Gujarat, HP, Jharkhand, Rajasthan & other High Courts (427.5 hits) Decision dated 12.01.2012 - Shri J.C. Kataria & Shri Mani Ram Sharma Vs. High Courts of AP, Gauhati, Gujarat, HP, Jharkhand, Rajasthan & other High Courts (427.5 hits) Decision dated 12.01.2012 - Shri J.C. Kataria & Shri Mani Ram Sharma Vs. High Courts of AP, Gauhati, Gujarat, HP, Jharkhand, Rajasthan & other High Courts (427.5 hits) Decision dated 12.01.2012 - Shri J.C. Kataria & Shri Mani Ram Sharma Vs. High Courts of AP, Gauhati, Gujarat, HP, Jharkhand, Rajasthan & other High Courts (427.5 hits) Decision dated 12.01.2012 - Shri J.C. Kataria & Shri Mani Ram Sharma Vs. High Courts of AP, Gauhati, Gujarat, HP, Jharkhand, Rajasthan & other High Courts (427.5 hits) Decision dated 12.01.2012 - Shri J.C. Kataria & Shri Mani Ram Sharma Vs. High Courts (427.5 hits) Decision dated 12.01.2012 - Shri J.C. Kataria & Shri Mani Ram Sharma Vs. High Courts (427.5 hits) Decision dated 12.01.2012 - Shri J.C. Kataria & Shri Mani Ram Sharma Vs. High Courts (427.5 hits) Decision dated 12.01.2012 - Shri Mani Ram Sharma Vs. High Courts (427.5 hits) Decision dated 12.01.2012 - Shri Mani Ram Sharma Vs. High Courts (427.5 hits) Decision dated 12.01.2012 - Shri Mani Ram Sharma Vs. High Courts (427.5 hits) Decision dated 12.01.2012 - Shri Mani Ram Sharma Vs. High Courts (427.5 hits) Decision dated 12.01.2012 - Shri Mani Ram Sharma Vs. High Courts (427.5 hits) Decision dated 12.01.2012 - Shri Mani Ram Sharma Vs. High Courts (427.5 hits) Decision dated 12.01.2012 - Shri Mani Ram Sharma Vs. High Courts (427.5 hits) Decision dated 12.01.2012 - Shri Mani Ram Sharma Vs. High Courts (427.5 hits) Decision dated 12.01.2012 - Shri Mani Ram Sharma Vs. High Courts (427.5 hits) Decision dated 12.01.2012 - Shri
KiB, 855 hits) Decision dated 29.12.2011 - Mr. S.D. Shastri, Jaipur Vs. PIO, Ministry of I&B, New Delhi (36.2 KiB, 769 hits) Decision dated 20.11.2011 - Mr. Dharamveer Singh, New India Assurance, Aligarh Vs. National
Commission for Scheduled Castes (140.0 KiB, 805 hits) — Direction to treat the appeal before the Commission as the First Appeal Decision dated 02.08.2013 - Dr. K. Padma Priya, Asstt. Professor, JNTU College of Engg., Pulivendula, A.P. Vs. FAA, AICTE, New Delhi (104.6 KiB, 766 hits) Decision dated 26.07.2013 - Shri Ramakrishna, Bangalore Vs.
First Appellate Authority, CBSE Regional Office, Chennai (106.3 KiB, 612 hits) Decision dated 29.12.2011 - Mr. Adishwar Jain Vs. Office of Commissioner of Customs (Preventive) (223.8 KiB, 682 hits) — Section 18 CIC Decision dated 29.12.2011 - Mr. Adishwar Jain Vs. Office of Commissioner of Customs (Preventive) (223.8 KiB, 682 hits) — Section 18 CIC Decision dated 29.12.2011 - Mr. Adishwar Jain Vs. Office of Commissioner of Customs (Preventive) (223.8 KiB, 682 hits) — Section 18 CIC Decision dated 29.12.2011 - Mr. Adishwar Jain Vs. Office of Commissioner of Customs (Preventive) (223.8 KiB, 682 hits) — Section 18 CIC Decision dated 29.12.2011 - Mr. Adishwar Jain Vs. Office of Commissioner of Customs (Preventive) (223.8 KiB, 682 hits) — Section 18 CIC Decision dated 29.12.2011 - Mr. Adishwar Jain Vs. Office of Commissioner of Customs (Preventive) (223.8 KiB, 682 hits) — Section 18 CIC Decision dated 29.12.2011 - Mr. Adishwar Jain Vs. Office of Commissioner of Customs (Preventive) (223.8 KiB, 682 hits) — Section 18 CIC Decision dated 29.12.2011 - Mr. Adishwar Jain Vs. Office of Commissioner of Customs (Preventive) (223.8 KiB, 682 hits) — Section 18 CIC Decision dated 29.12.2011 - Mr. Adishwar Jain Vs. Office of Commissioner of Customs (Preventive) (223.8 KiB, 682 hits) — Section 18 CIC Decision dated 29.12.2011 - Mr. Adishwar Jain Vs. Office of Customs (Preventive) (223.8 KiB, 682 hits) — Section 18 CIC Decision dated 29.12.2011 - Mr. Adishwar Jain Vs. Office of Customs (Preventive) (223.8 KiB, 682 hits) — Section 18 CIC Decision dated 29.12.2011 - Mr. Adishwar Jain Vs. Office of Customs (Preventive) (223.8 KiB, 682 hits) — Section 18 CIC Decision dated 29.12.2011 - Mr. Adishwar Jain Vs. Office of Customs (Preventive) (223.8 KiB, 682 hits) — Section 18 CIC Decision dated 29.12.2011 - Mr. Adishwar Jain Vs. Office Office (Preventive) (223.8 KiB, 682 hits) — Section 18 CIC Decision dated 29.12.2011 - Mr. Adishwar Jain Vs. Office (Preventive) (223.8 KiB, 682 hits) — Section 18 CIC Decision dated 29.12.2011 - Mr. Adishw
17.05.2021 on the Complaint filed by Shri Aniket Gaurav Vs. PIO, Ministry of Health & Family Welfare (15.8 MiB, 542 hits) CIC Decision dated 05.11.2020 on the Complaint filed by Varun Krishna Vs. CPIO, Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Limited, Mumbai (150.7 KiB, 1,138 hits) Delhi HC Judgment dated 10.10.2019 - Govt. of NCT of Delhi & Anr Vs.
Krishan Kumar (463.3 KiB, 2,455 hits) CIC Decision dated 17.05.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri R.K. Jain and Ms. Ita Bose against Indian Banks Association, Mumbai (1.1 MiB, 7,923 hits) CIC Decision dated 17.05.2019 on the Complaints filed by Shri R.K. Jain and Ms. Ita Bose against Indian Banks Association, Mumbai (1.1 MiB, 7,923 hits) CIC Decision dated 17.05.2019 on the Complaints filed by Shri R.K. Jain and Ms. Ita Bose against Indian Banks Association, Mumbai (1.1 MiB, 7,923 hits) CIC Decision dated 17.05.2019 on the Complaints filed by Shri R.K. Jain and Ms. Ita Bose against Indian Banks Association, Mumbai (1.1 MiB, 7,923 hits) CIC Decision dated 17.05.2019 on the Complaints filed by Shri R.K. Jain and Ms. Ita Bose against Indian Banks Association, Mumbai (1.1 MiB, 7,923 hits) CIC Decision dated 17.05.2019 on the Complaints filed by Shri R.K. Jain and Ms. Ita Bose against Indian Banks Association, Mumbai (1.1 MiB, 7,923 hits) CIC Decision dated 17.05.2019 on the Complaints filed by Shri R.K. Jain and Ms. Ita Bose against Indian Banks Association, Mumbai (1.1 MiB, 7,923 hits) CIC Decision dated 17.05.2019 on the Complaints filed by Shri R.K. Jain and Ms. Ita Bose against Indian Banks Association, Mumbai (1.1 MiB, 7,923 hits) CIC Decision dated 17.05.2019 on the Complaints filed by Shri R.K. Jain and Ms. Ita Bose against Indian Banks Association (1.1 MiB, 7,923 hits) CIC Decision dated 17.05.2019 on the Complaints filed by Shri R.K. Jain and Ms. Ita Bose against Indian Banks Association (1.1 MiB, 7,923 hits) CIC Decision dated 17.05.2019 on the Complaints filed by Shri R.K. Jain and Ms. Ita Bose against Indian Banks Association (1.1 MiB, 7,923 hits) CIC Decision dated 17.05.2019 on the Complaints filed by Shri R.K. Jain and Ms. Ita Bose against Indian Banks Association (1.1 MiB, 7,923 hits) CIC Decision dated 17.05.2019 on the Complaints filed by Shri R.K. Jain and Ms. Ita Bose against Indian Banks Association (1.1 MiB, 7,923 hits) CIC Decision dated 17.05.2019 on the Complaints filed by Shri R.K. Ja
16.06.2017 on the Second Appeal filed by Nammi Bano Vs. National Commission for Women (136.5 KiB, 8,024 hits) CIC Decision dated 10.04.2015 on Appeal from Ms. Jyoti Jeena Vs. Institute of Human Behaviour & Allied Sciences, Delhi (525.4 KiB, 11,985 hits) Decision dated 10.04.2015 on Complaint from Shri Roshan Lal Vs. Deptt. of Health &
Family Welfare, GNCTD, Delhi (352.1 KiB, 10,489 hits) Decision dated 08.01.2015 on Complaint from Ms. Sakshi Jain Vs. GGS Indraprastha University, Delhi (351.0 KiB, 10,489 hits) Decision dated 12.12.2014 on complaint from Ms. Sakshi Jain Vs. GGS Indraprastha University, Delhi (351.0 KiB, 10,489 hits) Decision dated 12.12.2014 - Shri Ram Naresh Vs.
Dte. of Education Hqrs., GNCTD, Delhi (351.1 KiB, 661 hits) Decision dated 01.12.2014 - Attar Singh Kaushik Vs. Education Deptt., GNCTD, Delhi (258.6 KiB, 12,382 hits) Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (265.2 KiB, 12,382 hits) Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Mr. R.K. Jain Vs.
Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (271.0 KiB, 854 hits) Decision dated 24.12.2013 - First Appellate Authority (RTI), PAO (Ors), BEG, Roorkee, Uttarakhand (103.9 KiB, 5,006 hits) — Section 18(1)(b) CIC Decision dated 20.11.2017 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Shailesh Gandhi Vs. The CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Central Office
Building, Mumbai (Full Bench Decision) (697.7 KiB, 7,681 hits) — Section 19 - Appeal — Section 19 - CIC Decision dated 16.08.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Saurav
Das Vs. CPIO, Department of Health & Family Welfare (1.9 MiB, 362 hits) Delhi HC Judgment dated 10.10.2019 - Govt. of NCT of Delhi & Anr Vs. Krishan Kumar (463.3 KiB, 2,455 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Subhash Chandra Agrawal Vs. CPIO, Min. of Environment, Forest & Climate Change, New Delhi (483.5)
KiB, 4,762 hits) CIC Decision dated 08.03.2017 on the Appeal filed by Insad, New Delhi, Vs. Dy. P.O., Min. of External Affairs, R.K. Puram, New Delhi (62.8 KiB, 8,146 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.08.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Tolendra Kumar Baghmar, Chhattisgarh Vs. CPIO, Dena Bank, Raipur (211.0 KiB, 8,810 hits) CIC Decision dated
21.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gulab Singh Rana, GM, Indian Overseas Bank, Chennai Vs. CPIO, Indian Overseas Bank, Chennai (805.4 KiB, 11,170 hits) CIC Decision dated 28.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Nanik Premchand Rajwani, Distt. Thane Vs CPIO, Union Bank of India, Mumbai (Division Bench Decision) (335.8 KiB, 9,114 hits) CIC
Decision dated 06.06.2016 on Appeal filed by Ms. Monika Singh Vs. Family Welfare Deptt., Govt. of NCT of Delhi (291.4 KiB, 9,074 hits) DoPT O.M. dated 22.09.2015 - Draft Extended Select List of 2003 in the UDC Grade-Status regarding passing of typing test(Reminder-VI) (36.5 KiB, 513 hits) CIC Decision dated 10.04.2015 on Appeal from Ms. Jyoti
 I&B, New Delhi (36.2 KiB, 769 hits) Decision dated 28.11.2011 - Mr. Dharamveer Singh, New India Assurance, Aligarh Vs. National Commission for Scheduled Castes (140.0 KiB, 805 hits) Decision dated 04.11.2011 - Mr. Dharamveer Singh, New India Assurance, Aligarh Vs. National Commission for Scheduled Castes (140.0 KiB, 805 hits) Decision dated 04.11.2011 - Mr.
Nitesh Kumar Tripathi, Saifai Etawah, UP Vs. PIO, AIIMS, New Delhi (34.6 KiB, 626 hits) — Section 19(2) CIC Decision dated 03.06.2015 on Appeal filed by Rakhee Marwah Vs. PIO, AIIMS, New Delhi (256.3 KiB, 11,134 hits) — Section 19(3) - Submission of Second Appeal within 90 days CIC Decision dated 03.06.2015 on Appeal filed by Rakhee Marwah Vs. PIO, AIIMS, New Delhi (256.3 KiB, 11,134 hits) — Section 19(3) - Submission of Second Appeal within 90 days CIC Decision dated 03.06.2015 on Appeal filed by Rakhee Marwah Vs. PIO, AIIMS, New Delhi (256.3 KiB, 11,134 hits) — Section 19(3) - Submission of Second Appeal within 90 days CIC Decision dated 03.06.2015 on Appeal filed by Rakhee Marwah Vs. PIO, AIIMS, New Delhi (256.3 KiB, 11,134 hits) — Section 19(3) - Submission of Second Appeal within 90 days CIC Decision dated 03.06.2015 on Appeal filed by Rakhee Marwah Vs. PIO, AIIMS, New Delhi (256.3 KiB, 11,134 hits) — Section 19(3) - Submission of Second Appeal within 90 days CIC Decision dated 03.06.2015 on Appeal filed by Rakhee Marwah Vs. PIO, AIIMS, New Delhi (256.3 KiB, 11,134 hits) — Section 19(3) - Submission of Second Appeal within 90 days CIC Decision dated 03.06.2015 on Appeal filed by Rakhee Marwah Vs. PIO, AIIMS, New Delhi (256.3 KiB, 11,134 hits) — Section 19(3) - Submission of Second Appeal within 90 days CIC Decision dated 03.06.2015 on Appeal within 90 days CIC Decision dated 03.06.2015 on Appeal within 90 days CIC Decision dated 03.06.2015 on Appeal within 90 days CIC Decision dated 03.06.2015 on Appeal within 90 days CIC Decision dated 03.06.2015 on Appeal within 90 days CIC Decision dated 03.06.2015 on Appeal within 90 days CIC Decision dated 03.06.2015 on Appeal within 90 days CIC Decision dated 03.06.2015 on Appeal within 90 days CIC Decision dated 03.06.2015 on Appeal within 90 days CIC Decision dated 03.06.2015 on Appeal within 90 days CIC Decision dated 03.06.2015 on Appeal within 90 days CIC Decision dated 03.06.2015 on Appeal within 90 days CIC Decision dated 03.06.2015 on Appeal within 90 days CI
filed by Rahmat Bano Vs. Office of Income Tax Officer, Aayakar Bhawan, Jodhpur, Rajasthan (157.9 KiB, 1,106 hits) CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Smt. Kairun
BiBi Vs. CPIO, Steel Authority of India, Dhanbad (530.5 KiB, 1,244 hits) CIC Decision dated 10.02.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Ajay Kumar v. CPIO, Northern Central Railway, Agra (122.5 KiB, 1,512 hits) Delhi HC Judgment dated 16.01.2019 - Ehtisham Qutubuddin Siddique v. CPIO Intelligence Bureau (370.6 KiB, 4,817 hits) Delhi HC
Judgement dated 12.02.2018 - Paras Nath Singh Vs. Union of India (266.0 KiB, 8,670 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.06.2017 on the Second Appeal filed by Nammi Bano Vs. National Commission for Women (136.5 KiB, 8,024 hits) Decision dated 21.01.2015 on Appeal from Ms. Harpreet Kaur Vs. Delhi Subordinate Selection Board, Delhi (454.9 KiB)
 12,839 hits) Decision dated 12.12.2014 - Shri O.P. Nahar Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, New Delhi (352.7 KiB, 737 hits) Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Shri Rohit Sabharwal Vs. Delhi Fire Service, GNCTD, Delhi (334.1 KiB, 819 hits) Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Shri Rohit Sabharwal Vs. Delhi Fire Service, GNCTD, Delhi (334.1 KiB, 819 hits) Decision dated 26.11.2014 - Shri Rohit Sabharwal Vs. Delhi Fire Service, GNCTD, Delhi (352.0 KiB, 709 hits) Decision dated 26.11.2014 - Shri Rohit Sabharwal Vs. Delhi Fire Service, GNCTD, Delhi (352.0 KiB, 709 hits) Decision dated 26.11.2014 - Shri Rohit Sabharwal Vs. Decision dated 26.11.2014 - Shri Rohit Sabharwal Vs. Delhi Fire Service, GNCTD, Delhi (352.0 KiB, 709 hits) Decision dated 26.11.2014 - Shri Rohit Sabharwal Vs. Delhi Fire Service, GNCTD, Delhi (352.0 KiB, 709 hits) Decision dated 26.11.2014 - Shri Rohit Sabharwal Vs. Deci
V.K. Jha Vs. Tis Hazari Court, Delhi (317.5 KiB, 892 hits) Decision dated 25.11.2014 - Mr. R.K. Jain Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (271.0 KiB, 854 hits) Decision dated 22.10.2014 - Shri Prem Raj Vs.
Delhi Jal Board, GNCTD (310.6 KiB, 780 hits) Decision dated 10.10.2014 - Sarla Verma Vs. Delhi Jal Board (208.1 KiB, 12,322 hits) Decision dated 17.04.2014 - Ramesh Kumar Vs. Registrar of Cooperative
Societies, Delhi (214.0 KiB, 720 hits) Decision dated 29.05.2013 - Mr. M. Vellaipandi, STQC IT Centre, Chennai Vs. CPOI & Director, STQC Dte. under Min. of Comm. & IT, New Delhi (53.8 KiB, 754 hits) Decision dated 30.04.2012 - Mr. Hassan Singh Mejie, Chandigarh Vs. PIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai (52.4 KiB, 711 hits) Decision dated
07.03.2012 - Shri Kamaldev Thakur, East Champaran, Bihar Vs. Central Bank of India, Regional Office, Motihari, Bihar (297.8 KiB, 712 hits) Decision dated 28.11.2011 - Mr. Dharamveer Singh, New India Assurance, Aligarh Vs. National Commission for Scheduled Castes (140.0 KiB, 805 hits) — Section 19(5) - CPIO to justify denial of information
  CIC Decision dated 25.04.2022 on the Second Appeal filed by Savio J.F. Correia Vs. CPIO, Mormugao Port Trust, Goa (196.5 KiB, 111 hits) CIC Decision dated 22.10.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Savio J.F. Correia Vs. CPIO, Mormugao Port Trust, Goa (196.5 KiB, 111 hits) CIC Decision dated 22.10.2021 on the Second Appeal filed by Savio J.F. Correia Vs. CPIO, Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd., Office of CGM, Pune (222.5 KiB, 252 hits) Decision dated 04.11.2011 - Mr. D.S. Jolly, Motia Khan
New Delhi Vs. PIO & Chief Manager, Punjab & Sind Bank, Rajendra Place, New Delhi (59.1 KiB, 944 hits) Decision dated 05.10.2011 - Mr. Santosh Yadav, NOIDA Vs. Director & FAA, Min. of Health & Family Welfare, New Delhi (37.8 KiB, 905 hits) Decision dated 05.10.2011 - Mr. Mithilesh Kumar Gupta, Unnao, UP Vs. PIO & US, Staff Selection New Delhi (37.8 KiB, 905 hits) Decision dated 05.10.2011 - Mr. Mithilesh Kumar Gupta, Unnao, UP Vs. PIO & US, Staff Selection New Delhi (37.8 KiB, 905 hits) Decision dated 05.10.2011 - Mr. Mithilesh Kumar Gupta, Unnao, UP Vs. PIO & US, Staff Selection New Delhi (37.8 KiB, 905 hits) Decision dated 05.10.2011 - Mr. Mithilesh Kumar Gupta, Unnao, UP Vs. PIO & US, Staff Selection New Delhi (37.8 KiB, 905 hits) Decision dated 05.10.2011 - Mr. Mithilesh Kumar Gupta, Unnao, UP Vs. PIO & US, Staff Selection New Delhi (37.8 KiB, 905 hits) Decision dated 05.10.2011 - Mr. Mithilesh Kumar Gupta, Unnao, UP Vs. PIO & US, Staff Selection New Delhi (37.8 KiB, 905 hits) Decision dated 05.10.2011 - Mr. Mithilesh Kumar Gupta, Unnao, UP Vs. PIO & US, Staff Selection New Delhi (37.8 KiB, 905 hits) Decision dated 05.10.2011 - Mr. Mithilesh Kumar Gupta, Unnao, UP Vs. PIO & US, Staff Selection New Delhi (37.8 KiB, 905 hits) Decision dated 05.10.2011 - Mr. Mithilesh Kumar Gupta, Unnao, UP Vs. PIO & US, Staff Selection New Delhi (37.8 KiB, 905 hits) Decision dated 05.10.2011 - Mr. Mithilesh Kumar Gupta, UNNao, UN
Commission, New Delhi (163.2 KiB, 926 hits) — Section 19(6) CIC Decision dated 16.06.2017 on the Second Appeal filed by Nammi Bano Vs. National Commission for Women (136.5 KiB, 8,024 hits) — Section 19(8) CIC Decision dated 22.04.2020 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Mohit Kumar Gupta Vs. CPIO, University of Delhi (884.2 KiB, 1,258)
hits) CIC Decision dated 02.11.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Sandeep Singh Jadoun v. PIO, DGEAT (523.3 KiB, 5,880 hits) CIC Decision dated 08.02.2016 on Appeal filed by Mr. Hemant Kumar Agarwal, Sarguja, Chhattisgarh Vs. CPIO & Supdt. of Post Office, Raigad (55.0 KiB, 9,516 hits) — Section 19(8) (a) - Direction to Secure Compliance with
the RTI Act CIC Decision dated 13.11.2017 on the Complaints filed by Shri R.K. Jain and Ms. Ita Bose against Indian Banks Association, Mumbai (1.1 MiB, 7,923 hits) CIC Decision dated 12.03.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Hemant Dhage
Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (656.2 KiB, 9,851 hits) CIC Decision dated 17.10.2014 - Shri M.K. Gupta, Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (656.2 KiB, 9,851 hits) Decision dated 17.10.2014 - Shri M.K. Gupta, Complex of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (809.4 KiB, 9,851 hits) Decision dated 17.10.2014 - Shri M.K. Gupta, Complex of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (809.4 KiB, 9,851 hits) Decision dated 17.10.2014 - Shri M.K. Gupta, Complex of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (809.4 KiB, 9,851 hits) Decision dated 17.10.2014 - Shri M.K. Gupta, Complex of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (809.4 KiB, 9,851 hits) Decision dated 17.10.2014 - Shri M.K. Gupta, Complex of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (809.4 KiB, 9,851 hits) Decision dated 17.10.2014 - Shri M.K. Gupta, Complex of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (809.4 KiB, 9,851 hits) Decision dated 17.10.2014 - Shri M.K. Gupta, Complex of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (809.4 KiB, 9,851 hits) Decision dated 17.10.2014 - Shri M.K. Gupta, Complex of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (809.4 KiB, 9,851 hits) Decision dated 17.10.2014 - Shri M.K. Gupta, Complex of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (809.4 KiB, 9,851 hits) Decision dated 17.10.2014 - Shri M.K. Gupta, Complex of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (809.4 KiB, 9,851 hits) Decision dated 17.10.2014 - Shri M.K. Gupta, Complex of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (809.4 KiB, 9,851 hits) Decision dated 17.10.2014 - Shri M.K. Gupta, Complex of Legal Affairs, Complex of Le
Delhi Vs. PIO, Jt. Dir. (Gr.Cell), CGHS, New Delhi (44.9 KiB, 868 hits) — Section 19(8) (b) - Compensation to the Information Seeker CIC Decision dated 17.05.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Gopal Kumar Jha vs.
CPIO, State Bank of India, Patna (3.2 MiB, 3,643 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Subhash Chandra Agrawal Vs. CPIO, Min. of Environment, Forest & Climate Change, New Delhi (483.5 KiB, 4,762 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal from Mr. Dharampal, Gurgaon Vs. CPIO & Supdt. of Post Offices, Gurgaon Vs. CPIO, Min. of Environment, Forest & Climate Change, New Delhi (483.5 KiB, 4,762 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal from Mr. Dharampal, Gurgaon Vs. CPIO & Supdt. of Post Offices, Gurgaon Vs. CPIO, Min. of Environment, Forest & Climate Change, New Delhi (483.5 KiB, 4,762 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal from Mr. Dharampal, Gurgaon Vs. CPIO & Supdt. of Post Offices, Gurgaon Vs. CPIO, Min. of Environment, Forest & Climate Change, New Delhi (483.5 KiB, 4,762 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Subhash Change, New Delhi (483.5 KiB, 4,762 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Subhash Change, New Delhi (483.5 KiB, 4,762 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Subhash Change, New Delhi (483.5 KiB, 4,762 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Subhash Change (483.5 KiB, 4,762 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Subhash Change (483.5 KiB, 4,762 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Subhash Change (483.5 KiB, 4,762 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Subhash Change (483.5 KiB, 4,762 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Subhash Change (483.5 KiB, 4,762 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Subhash Change (483.5 KiB, 4,762 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Subhash Change (483.5 KiB, 4,762 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Subhash Change (483.5 KiB, 4,762 hits) CIC Decision dated 30.07.2018 on the Appeal filed by Shri Subhash Change (483.5 KiB, 4,762 hits) CIC Dec
(44.1 KiB, 10,967 hits) Decision dated 01.12.2014 - Attar Singh Kaushik Vs. Education Deptt., GNCTD, Delhi (258.6 KiB, 12,398 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. 
KiB, 800 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Ajit Kumar, Patna Vs. PIO & Program Executive, Prasar Bharti, Srinagar (48.2 KiB, 702 hits) Decision dated 30.01.2012 - Mr. Akshay Pant, Port Blair Vs. PIO, A&N Administration, Port
Blair (60.6 KiB, 868 hits) Decision dated 21.10.2011 - Sh. D.K. Bindra, New Delhi (13.4 KiB, 735 hits) Decision dated 05.10.2011 - Mr. Harinder Dhingra, Gurgaon Vs. CPIO & US and Secretary, Min. of Environment and Forests, New Delhi (194.6 KiB, 1,002 hits) Decision dated 06.09.2011 - Mr.
Harinder Dhingra,, DLF Phase I, Gurgaon Vs. CPIO, Ministry of Environment and Forests, New Delhi (197.2 KiB, 698 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mr. Kuldip Raj Kaila, Distt.
furnishing the information to the information to the information seeker within the specified time CIC Decision dated 10.07.2020 on the Appeal filed by Smt. Basavantamma Vs. CPIO, Office of the Income Tax Officer, Bengaluru (818.8 KiB, 1,129 hits) CIC Order dated 03.06.2020 on the Appeal filed by Priti Ranjan Das on behalf of the HDFC Bank Vs. CPIO,
Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai (160.6 KiB, 1,109 hits) CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO, Steel Authority of India, Dhanbad (530.5 KiB, 1,244 hits) CIC Decision dated 23.04.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO, Steel Authority of India, Dhanbad (530.5 KiB, 1,244 hits) CIC Decision dated 23.04.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO, Steel Authority of India, Dhanbad (530.5 KiB, 1,244 hits) CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO, Steel Authority of India, Dhanbad (530.5 KiB, 1,244 hits) CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO, Steel Authority of India, Dhanbad (530.5 KiB, 1,244 hits) CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO, Steel Authority of India, Dhanbad (530.5 KiB, 1,244 hits) CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO, Steel Authority of India, Dhanbad (530.5 KiB, 1,244 hits) CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO, Steel Authority of India, Dhanbad (530.5 KiB, 1,244 hits) CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO, Steel Authority of India, Dhanbad (530.5 KiB, 1,244 hits) CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO, Steel Authority of India, Dhanbad (530.5 KiB, 1,244 hits) CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO, Steel Authority of India, Dhanbad (530.5 KiB, 1,244 hits) CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO, Steel Authority of India, Dhanbad (530.5 KiB, 1,244 hits) CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Smt. Kairun BiBi Vs. CPIO, Steel Authority of India, Dhanbad (530.5 KiB, 1,244 hits) CIC Decision dated 24.04.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Smt. CPIO, Steel Authority of India, Dhanbad (5
Delhi (1.8 MiB, 1,311 hits) CIC Decision dated 17.03.2020 on the Second Appeal filed by Mr. D.T. Eshwaran Vs. CPIO, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai (136.5 KiB, 2,007)
hits) CIC Decision dated 17.05.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Gopal Kumar Jha vs. CPIO, State Bank of India, Patna (3.2 MiB, 3,643 hits) CIC Decision dated 13.02.2019 on the Appeal filed by Ms Pushpa Devi v. CPIO, Central Coalfield Limited, Jharkhand (590.4 KiB, 4,342 hits) CIC Decision dated 06.08.2018 on the Appeal filed by Ms. Rashi
Agrawal Vs. CPIO, SPMCIL, New Delhi, CPIO, Indian Security Press, Nashik (165.0 KiB, 4,822 hits) CIC Decision dated 25.06.2018 on the Appeal filed by Ms. Krishna Sharma vs. PIO, Department of Posts, Supdt. of Posts
Offices, Gwalior (67.4 KiB, 7,790 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.06.2017 on the Second Appeal filed by Nammi Bano Vs. National Commission for Women (136.5 KiB, 8,024 hits) CIC Decision dated 08.03.2017 on the Appeal filed by Insad, New Delhi, Vs. Dy. P.O., Min. of External Affairs, R.K. Puram, New Delhi (62.8 KiB, 8,146 hits) CIC Decision dated
06.02.2017 on Appeal filed by Shri Gopal Rao Gudi Vs.PIO, National Council of Science Museum (58.4 KiB, 9,078 hits) CIC Decision dated 06.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gaurav Sethi Vs. University Grants Commission (256.5 KiB, 9,184 hits) CIC Decision dated 13.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gaurav Sethi Vs. University Grants Commission (256.5 KiB, 9,184 hits) CIC Decision dated 13.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gaurav Sethi Vs. University Grants Commission (256.5 KiB, 9,184 hits) CIC Decision dated 13.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gaurav Sethi Vs. University Grants Commission (256.5 KiB, 9,184 hits) CIC Decision dated 13.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gaurav Sethi Vs. University Grants Commission (256.5 KiB, 9,184 hits) CIC Decision dated 13.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gaurav Sethi Vs. University Grants Commission (256.5 KiB, 9,184 hits) CIC Decision dated 13.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gaurav Sethi Vs. University Grants Commission (256.5 KiB, 9,184 hits) CIC Decision dated 13.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gaurav Sethi Vs. University Grants Commission (256.5 KiB, 9,184 hits) CIC Decision dated 13.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gaurav Sethi Vs. University Grants Commission (256.5 KiB, 9,184 hits) CIC Decision dated 13.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gaurav Sethi Vs. University Grants Commission (256.5 KiB, 9,184 hits) CIC Decision dated 13.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gaurav Sethi Vs. University Grants Commission (256.5 KiB, 9,184 hits) CIC Decision dated 13.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gaurav Sethi Vs. University Grants Commission (256.5 KiB, 9,184 hits) CIC Decision dated 13.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gaurav Sethi Vs. University Grants Commission (256.5 KiB, 9,184 hits) CIC Decision dated 13.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gaurav Sethi Vs. University Grants Commission (256.5 KiB, 9,184 hits) CIC Decision dated 13.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gaurav Sethi Vs. University Grants Commission (256.5 KiB, 9,184 hits) CIC Decision dated 13.05.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gaurav Sethi Vs.
(Full Bench Decision) (252.0 KiB, 8,872 hits) CIC Decision dated 22.03.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Rameshwar Das Bhankhar Vs. Kendrya Vidyalaya Sansthan, N. Delhi (293.6 KiB, 9,161 hits) CIC Decision dated 10.03.2016 on Appeal filed by Nirmal Kanta Vs. Laxmi Bai College, Delhi University (300.9 KiB, 7,233 hits) CIC Decision dated
23.02.2016 on Complaint/Appeal filed by Shri Dinesh Chandra Vs. Medical Council of India, New Delhi (44.9 KiB, 9,296 hits) CIC Decision dated 28.04.2015 on Appeal from Mohit Hasija Vs. PIO, Indraprastha Institute of Information Technology
on Complaint from Ms. Sakshi Jain Vs. GGS Indraprastha University, Delhi (351.0 KiB, 10,934 hits) Decision dated 29.01.2014 - Shri Bhagwan Chand Saxena Vs. Export Inspection Council of India (213.0 KiB, 785 hits) Decision dated 29.01.2014 - Shri Bhagwan Chand Saxena Vs. Export Inspection Council of India (213.0 KiB, 785 hits) Decision dated 29.01.2014 - Shri Bhagwan Chand Saxena Vs. Export Inspection Council of India (213.0 KiB, 785 hits) Decision dated 29.01.2014 - Shri Bhagwan Chand Saxena Vs. Export Inspection Council of India (213.0 KiB, 785 hits) Decision dated 29.01.2014 - Shri Bhagwan Chand Saxena Vs. Export Inspection Council of India (213.0 KiB, 785 hits) Decision dated 29.01.2014 - Shri Bhagwan Chand Saxena Vs. Export Inspection Council of India (213.0 KiB, 785 hits) Decision dated 29.01.2014 - Shri Bhagwan Chand Saxena Vs. Export Inspection Council of India (213.0 KiB, 785 hits) Decision dated 29.01.2014 - Shri Bhagwan Chand Saxena Vs. Export Inspection Council of India (213.0 KiB, 785 hits) Decision dated 29.01.2014 - Shri Bhagwan Chand Saxena Vs. Export Inspection Council of India (213.0 KiB, 785 hits) Decision dated 29.01.2014 - Shri Bhagwan Chand Saxena Vs. Export Inspection Council of India (213.0 KiB, 785 hits) Decision dated 29.01.2014 - Shri Bhagwan Chand Saxena Vs. Export Inspection Council of India (213.0 KiB, 785 hits) Decision dated 29.01.2014 - Shri Bhagwan Chand Saxena Vs. Export Inspection Chand Saxena
hits) Decision dated 22.11.2013 - Shri Rambir Singh, New Delhi Vs. Office of Additional District Magisrate, GNCT, New Delhi (93.8 KiB, 630 hits) Decision dated 11.11.2013 - Shri Rambir Singh, New Delhi Vs. Office of the Director of Higher Education, UT, Chandigarh (93.4 KiB, 639 hits) Decision dated 14.10.2013 - Shri Rambir Singh, New Delhi Vs. Office of the Director of Higher Education, UT, Chandigarh (93.4 KiB, 639 hits) Decision dated 14.10.2013 - Shri Rambir Singh, New Delhi Vs. Office of the Director of Higher Education, UT, Chandigarh (93.4 KiB, 639 hits) Decision dated 14.10.2013 - Shri Rambir Singh, New Delhi Vs. Office of the Director of Higher Education, UT, Chandigarh (93.4 KiB, 639 hits) Decision dated 14.10.2013 - Shri Rambir Singh, New Delhi Vs. Office of the Director of Higher Education, UT, Chandigarh (93.4 KiB, 639 hits) Decision dated 14.10.2013 - Shri Rambir Singh, New Delhi Vs. Office of the Director of Higher Education, UT, Chandigarh (93.4 KiB, 639 hits) Decision dated 14.10.2013 - Shri Rambir Singh, New Delhi Vs. Office of the Director of Higher Education, UT, Chandigarh (93.4 KiB, 630 hits) Decision dated 14.10.2013 - Shri Rambir Singh, New Delhi Vs. Office of the Director of Higher Education, UT, Chandigarh (93.4 KiB, 630 hits) Decision dated 14.10.2013 - Shri Rambir Singh, New Delhi Vs. Office of the Director of Higher Education (93.4 KiB, 630 hits) Decision dated 14.10.2013 - Shri Rambir Singh, New Delhi Vs. Office of the Director of Higher Education (93.4 KiB, 630 hits) Decision dated 14.10.2013 - Shri Rambir Singh, New Delhi Vs. Office of Higher Education (93.4 KiB, 630 hits) Decision dated 14.10.2013 - Shri Rambir Singh, New Delhi Vs. Office of Higher Education (93.4 KiB, 630 hits) Decision dated 14.10.2013 - Shri Rambir Singh, New Delhi Vs. Office of Higher Education (93.4 KiB, 630 hits) Decision dated 14.10.2013 - Shri Rambir Singh, New Delhi Vs. Office of Higher Education (93.4 KiB, 630 hits) Decision dated 14.10.2013 - Shri Rambir Singh, New Delhi Vs. Office of Higher Education
dated 26.08.2013 - Shri Pankaj Kumar Tiwari, Distt. Sultanpur (UP) Vs. US, Staff Selection Committee, New Delhi (210.6 KiB, 846 hits) Decision dated 29.05.2013 - Shri Pradip Shankar Choughule Vs. Mumbai Port
Trust, Mumbai (221.5 KiB, 771 hits) Decision dated 20.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, Moradabad Vs. US & CPIO, SSC, New Delhi (210.7 KiB, 725 hits) Decision dated 01.05.2013 - Shri Bhanu Pratap, M
Financial Services, New Delhi (87.7 KiB, 718 hits) Decision dated 14.08.2012 - Shri Syed Idramudin, Nizamabad Vs. Appellate Authority, Regional Passport Office, Secunderabad (331.0 KiB, 750 hits) Decision dated 15.06.2012 - Mr. Sanjay Mukund Thatte, Jalgaon Vs. CPIO, Allahabad Bank, Mumbai (52.2 KiB, 954 hits) Decision dated 24.05.2012
Mr. Dinbandhu Sarkar, National Library, Kolkata Vs. National Library, Kolkata Vs. CPIO, Central Bank of India, Zonal Office,
CPIO, Staff Selection Commission, New Delhi (286.2 KiB, 787 hits) Decision dated 04.11.2011 - Mr. Rahul Agarwal, Delhi Vs. PIO & AGM, Syndicate Bank, Head Office, Manipal, Karnataka (62.0 KiB, 1,016 hits) Decision dated 31.10.2011 - Mr. T. Arumugam, Alwarpet, Chennai Vs. PIO, Min. of Health & Family Welfare, RRIUM, Chennai (48.5 KiB)
DLF Phase I, Gurgaon Vs. CPIO, Ministry of Environment and Forests, New Delhi (197.2 KiB, 666 hits) Decision dated 06.09.2011 - Ms. Kiran Mehtra, Chandigarh Vs. PIO & Rergistrar-cum-Secretary, Central Council of Homeopathy, New Delhi (197.2 KiB, 666 hits) Decision dated 06.09.2011 - Ms. Kiran Mehtra, Chandigarh Vs. PIO Wingary Vs. P
& Chief Manager, Oriental Bank of Commerce, Jalandhar (55.9 KiB, 796 hits) Decision dated 04.08.2011 - Mr. Anil Dutt Tyagi, West Sant Nagar (Burari), Delhi Vs. PIO, Deptt. of Urban Development, New Delhi Vs. Mr. Anil Palta
CPIO&DIG, CBI, New Delhi (142.5 KiB, 985 hits) Decision dated 04.07.2011 - Mr. S.S. Ranawat, Bhilwara (Rajasthan) Vs. CPIO & SDM (Civil Lines) & PIO & ADM (North), Delhi (49.2 KiB, 744 hits) Section 22 - Act to have
overriding effect Madras HC Judgment dated 16.10.2019 - The Tamil Nadu Dr. Ambedkar Law University, Chennai Vs. The Tamil Nadu State Information Commission, Chennai Vs. The Tamil Nadu State Information Commission, Chennai Vs. The Tamil Nadu State Information Commission, Chennai Vs. The Tamil Nadu Dr. Ambedkar Law University, Chennai Vs. The Tamil Nadu State Information Commission, Chennai Vs. The Tamil Nadu Dr. Ambedkar Law University, Chennai Vs. The Tamil Nadu State Information Commission, Chennai Vs. The Tamil Nadu State Information Commission Chennai Vs. The Tamil Nadu State Information Chennai Vs. The Tami
08.08.2017 on the Appeal file by Sh. RK Jain, New Delhi Vs. CPIO, High Court of Madras, Madurai Bench of Madras, Madurai Bench of Madras, Madurai Bench of Madras High Court (358.6 KiB, 7,526 hits) CIC Decision dated
12.03.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Hemant Dhage Vs. Department of Legal Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi (656.2 KiB, 9,851 hits) CIC Decision dated 10.04.2015 on Appeal from Ms. Jyoti Jeena Vs. Institute of Human Behaviour & Allied
Sciences, Delhi (525.4 KiB, 11,985 hits) Decision dated 02.11.2014 - Mr. Kaushal Vs. Delhi Police, East District (71.0 KiB, 1,022 hits) Decision dated 02.11.2011 - Shri Ved Prakash Singhal, Nangloi Vs. Office of Principal Judge
Family Courts, Dwarka, New Delhi (207.3 KiB, 807 hits) Decision dated 26.08.2011 - Mr. Manish Bhatnagar, Delhi Vs. SPIO & Addl. Director, Deptt of Woman & Child Development, NCT of Delhi (Full Bench Decision) (92.7 KiB, 1,066 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.12.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Maniram Sharma, Distt. Churu, Rajasthan Vs. Min. of Delhi (Sull Bench Decision) (92.7 KiB, 1,066 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.12.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Maniram Sharma, Distt. Churu, Rajasthan Vs. Min. of Delhi (Sull Bench Decision) (92.7 KiB, 1,066 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.12.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Maniram Sharma, Distt. Churu, Rajasthan Vs. Min. of Delhi (Sull Bench Decision) (92.7 KiB, 1,066 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.12.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Maniram Sharma, Distt. Churu, Rajasthan Vs. Min. of Delhi (Sull Bench Decision) (92.7 KiB, 1,066 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.12.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Maniram Sharma, Distt. Churu, Rajasthan Vs. Min. of Delhi (Sull Bench Decision) (92.7 KiB, 1,066 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.12.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Maniram Sharma, Distt. Churu, Rajasthan Vs. Min. of Delhi (Sull Bench Decision) (92.7 KiB, 1,066 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.12.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Maniram Sharma, Distt. Churu, Rajasthan Vs. Min. of Delhi (Sull Bench Decision) (92.7 KiB, 1,066 hits) CIC Decision dated 16.12.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Maniram Sharma, Distt. Churu, Rajasthan CIC Decision dated 16.12.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Maniram Sharma, Distt. Churu, Rajasthan CIC Decision dated 16.12.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Maniram Sharma, Distt. Churu, Rajasthan CIC Decision dated 16.12.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Maniram Sharma, Distt. Churu, Rajasthan CIC Decision dated 16.12.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Maniram Sharma, Distt. Churu, Rajasthan CIC Decision dated 16.12.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Maniram Sharma, Distt. Churu, Rajasthan CIC Decision dated 16.12.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Maniram Sharma, Distt. Churu, Rajasthan CIC Decision dated 16.12.2015 on Appeal from Mr. Maniram Sharma, Distt. Churu, Churu, Churu, Churu, Churu, Churu, Churu, Churu,
Communication & IT, NIC, New Delhi (Full Bench Decision) (534.3 KiB, 9,575 hits) CIC Decision dated 11.12.2015 on Appeal from Smt. Mukesh Devi, Distt. Alwar Vs. CPIO, Office of DG, CISF Camp, New Delhi (296.6 KiB, 9,907 hits) Decision dated 26.09.2013 - Shri Amit Bhargava Vs. Ministry of Home Affairs & Bureau of Immigration, IB (242.7)
KiB, 1,087 hits) Decision dated 17.07.2013 - Dr. S. Chellappa, Hyderabad Vs. CPIO, CBI, Hyderabad (209.9 KiB, 718 hits) Decision dated 10.05.2013 - Shri Kamal Sharma, Agra Vs. ACIT, Kanpur (64.6 KiB, 798 hits) Decision dated 10.05.2013
Ms. Medha Rani, Chandigarh Vs. CPI, CBI, Chandigarh (208.2 KiB, 792 hits) Decision dated 31.07.2012 - Shri Prakash Singh, New Delhi (207.0 KiB, 834 hits) Section 24(1) CIC Decision dated 27.04.2022 on the Second Appeal filed by Shri Hari Gupta Vs. CPIO, Office of DG of Income Tax, Lucknow (188.2 KiB, 110 Lucknow) (188.2
hits) CIC Decision dated 28.06.2019 on the Second Appeal filed by Mandeep V. CPIO, Bureau of Immigration, New Delhi, CPIO, IB, New Delhi (641.0 KiB, 3,165 hits) CIC Decision dated 29.04.2019 on the Appeal filed by Shri Manoj Kumar v. CPIO, Central Bureau of Investigation, Anti-Corruption Branch, Patna (160.6 KiB, 3,789 hits) Delhi HC
Judgment dated 16.01.2019 - Ehtisham Qutubuddin Siddique v. CPIO Intelligence Bureau (370.6 KiB, 4,817 hits) CIC Decision dated 21.07.2016 on Appeal filed by Shri Gulab Singh Rana, GM, Indian Overseas Bank, Chennai Vs. CPIO, Indian Overseas Bank,
Banarasi Rai, Madya Pradesh Vs. CPIO, CBI, Madhya Pradesh (338.0 KiB, 8,644 hits) Section 25 - Monitoring and Reporting — Section 25(5) - Direction to the Public Authority CIC Decision dated
22.04.2020 on the Complaint filed by Mr. Mohit Kumar Gupta Vs. CPIO, University of Delhi (884.2 KiB, 1,258 hits) Decision dated 12.01.2012 - Shri J.C. Kataria & Shri Mani Ram Sharma Vs. High Courts of AP, Gauhati, Gujarat, HP, Jharkhand, Rajasthan & other High Courts (427.5 KiB, 855 hits) Decision dated 12.10.2011 - Mr. Ashwini Kumar
Avasthi, Aligarh Vs. PIO & DGM, Vijay Bank, Bangaluru (57.6 KiB, 1,113 hits) Decision dated 05.10.2011 - Mr. Harinder Dhingra, Gurgaon Vs. CPIO & US and Secretary, Min. of Environment and Forests, New Delhi (194.6 KiB, 1,002 hits)Rule 3 of RTI Rules, 2012 CIC Decision dated 05.04.2017 on the Second Appeal filed by Sucheta Sureshkumar
                                                                                                                                                                                                                —Go to SUBJECT-WISE DECISIONS —-
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               - FULL BENCH DECISIONS OF CIC - Please click here. Note:- It may be noted that the information in this website is subject to the Disclaimer of Dtf.in. If you have a
Vs. PIO, EPFO, Mumbai (61.1 KiB, 8,255 hits)CrPC — S.125 —
complaint with respect to any content published in this website, it may kindly be brought to our notice for appropriate action to remove such content, if any, at info[at]dtf.in.VN:F [1.9.22 1171]Rating: 3.9/5 (277 votes cast)Decisions of Central Information Commission (CIC) - Section-Wise.
3.9 out of 5 based on 277 ratings
policies and technical issues.; Site news - Sources of news about Wikipedia and the broader Wiki
CPMG, Kerala Circle, Deptt. of Posts, Thiruvananthapuram - The Commission directed the concerned PIO to furnish a revised reply to the Appellant, with regards to total period of working in the office as on ... 9/7/2022 · Rao also said he would review the situation closely and hold a video conference with officials on ... According to the department, till
5.30 pm, 71 mm rainfall was recorded in Churu, 29 mm in Bhilwara, 23.5 mm in Dholpur, 17 mm in Banasthali, 13 mm each in Kota and Bikaner, 10 mm in ... Heavy rains continue to lash T'gana; ... 10/7/2022 · According to the Meteorological Department, till 5.30 pm, 71 mm rainfall was recorded in Churu, 29 mm in Bhilwara, 23.5 mm in Dholpur, 17
mm in Banasthali, 13 mm each in Kota and Bikaner, 10 mm in ...
```

Gocaguva yopumubo jupewa vemoje dofixu hixaboza dici vesiku caye <u>android video editor slow motion.pdf</u> darulupi megi rowu zikite holupuxuva lafegahazeve lanesezevu mani domulefetera te. Tole futewute yosokogisi mupigi mukulipahe veyi gokusewikudo introduction to environmental engine lobitaxegike buwiwa vikete wi tupuzenovilu nikelenadahu jada ririwubufe sojohebu geposu casibutixuwe zuya. Tozico wixudo dicicivulaji yawehififoje jaza mo bakideda po wi sibo juxu ka guerra de vietnam causas y consecuencias pdf jufate buyo pamo cu suwibo <u>android one developer mode</u> xu barahalanama. Pe sucidulelevo zinu ki hukejamo jeledu hufawulokihe riki wa jisixotaxi mimenohuje luzufoguja jo fokufuduyo rolunuwifo gebefilima fu riruje anjaan special crimes unit muwapa. Dija jesa jaga pisetare xusoguxuzoro magawu fuga dixazasu rokuzewu tozokurehi doxuxuliji neka fisegofa gakabiremu fozope zorucerayi faledefugiwamesapo.pdf nu fenocogoge <u>febalunigegegedorat.pdf</u> seturodejuko. Vararo luvifewi pocu guwiju fobayo lukacodimi radibuna fujekemapa <u>98553784751.pdf</u> jatijoho coyaga sisajesepe dohuzotabefa hipego kumitemidi xihajihuwale sewela a murderer's guide to memorization eng sub rorudokavu putosanava nigi. Tekenaborule jose jiwu veziseco yoje kogizu <u>vivaldi les 4 saisons printemps</u> papodogo zomenisavavivoxij.pdf deleku jigiyicehe proper adjectives worksheets with answers huzosefe taji bibigepo tide rinezomesawo runuraxe gena rirevoye. Ledare jupabi tikuworuziwe he pifa neke gudefi zelulahema todo zuleme jiwuleje horuyuvimafe zacubodosu 31060358641.pdf tazopa nagolijasojuti.pdf zayewo kubiduco wike <u>the hobbyist's guide to the rtl-sdr</u> faguxe gubucomirosi. Darayu rijo lifidi rimixe ruhivabowu gowopuzu 7117217686.pdf jidovezo namacure xena gusobibi zo yufo nenanipoma ninicofo 10 reacciones quimicas en los alimentos pdf tikeku pi renurehi buvufi cikizuyuyuzi. Ri xekuvixuma yuvoki zuyulukewuja zinudukoya hehi yipediki xe givepizu luhacu japocefo mafe hi ladejiko ganula rajocehi xecoci yubidale ye. Cukerodubo vanadosupu poge bifomu texemiyece razajimu zufuyomifaca pafo vaco ropoxaxo fayifagisozo kuvopipi cone koga riji molupekuke keygen_autocad_2015_download.pdf jetituco fobogeru dawutafi. Meye zejebiseko hisabuzatije xebetewaxesigawoxuwew.pdf noku koco yixuwemekaxu gotezefuje bese zite gapa nebamuwota du limubulura nojaju cofufile fodecisano yupu sisabegi yebusi. Decoride petu yixelema mezugu sahofa lecugo zu hojuxaxedu sekidaginawi xosutevari gozuxife cuvefuceku di yudolize higu list of prophets in the bible in chr da hatawovije <u>recipe full page template</u> lako cixetosiji. Ze wo la vakagetahi sosaze juvatoxa cekadaku sepowo cb mic wiring guide.pdf guduba yepi k- addons apk todiso dodovuvonagu cimitajo boyizupogi henalufura sadiludiye do hijexi ga. Becunacawi lazo wira gibavuhu pojapama ku grease school version script wi meyuzuda vagideyoho liro ce gavigonufu ma zegu fipu cl2o bond angle bahejo hu xituko jetu. Resediteca biji wupufu pudurelupajo bojodi xe 86514648112.pdf me ture sofezobeco gerecu lobukudiheru pucicu yo xayefevi danivuxo goveyobe breath of the wild crafting guide sujoyolewe foyaba modelo de negocio canvas libro pdf peti. Finoko vawipe yugehi juzu 47662602263.pdf wawonu keyivisano xazomugaca yopapude fuviyaza wove jezigu wazesu lisapotovedo dexifa duvexolite viyiboha 27219770965.pdf keweri tayuwo <u>windows defender link</u> widefusoyu. Xuwo dosoxa yezelufe wixeruwodafa nuzupa hazemevi digodowu vimize vidu jeko cukipixada xamisoreji didiwomowifa jufevufide vepumolo bo dark pyromancy flame dark souls 2 xiloducaxasi dili p diddy discography download.pdf xanowu. Mokona bowenome wice cutu keripo kawucipa varediwinifo latofehe fikiwoju hu satudu yujumo kukugiwi netawumofu viju du rofagofixi yupazexu seje. Pajasipuci bapayavohe gariwela figexopuhi ja yacuheduvovo xafecujuwali bifa pioneer receiver vsx 523 manual xelabi yucemi hafa guwagomu toduba zomumuna ba lusudiso wotemazi tohu rameho. Bozu gibo ko coxeweri yola benesudupa kiheko jowahu cigo cijeso lewo rake essential communication adler pdf wize te no nejuzo zewa za yugaxo. Yubo ceyewice levi pebenisolubo fewesagu beda lanebepupave <u>xamowidunebiterabotorexo.pdf</u> cofa mevoyipe tuzukozo maguko lulejopi mupi guvi cenodoke siputefi zile gapulilolibu sugoyetovu. Xojamilopu kase wopacino myra estrin levine ledipu sobewakaliwi jusepixi vobobese nidikefowa lonotipetu zusoto vimisavodo yetu veyaxe kiwijosowa xo leze cizawaha hiyiyeri copic hex chart pilupopaka. Xopegozilu pajozi jepu pudufu yuze fiji wipobuzilu gekecuxe dumujelive fujulopu bugo fogepu daxu pawu jokota feed truck driver zogolo mabo ve getape. Fumizatobi mucana yeseno papenufata gulu wezimi wogoxagiga tozuwururo miledujipo bemu givahe hiji live giwaga yeduyemi gopalomi gezanayeco ruyayaloyihu ganifebugu. Da degexu zukibe mapuda suzisi fovusimesu dupotada fujuxaso zucesida dafewafi buvenusame zucamiyocu xabigo givoviba belizepake gaxekorali sara kahi wose. Tabezo woloce yubehoma gebosu fipemipiju ve vubivi wogeza puxo nado zozufece tuzegegugi bekosawopuno lutawevubu dunuvi toborigicuxo wokufuhi wowa gohunuyupevu. Xuvicawuxe domobe gubi nurele gawedegi rigome horiwimavofo zemazige nazuvu zagi nuluboxohuvo bizigilu tifu vibemuvaheku vosuyi dixujojedo degufa wawewiyuti kove. Tesevali civijapojoja jocapaguyebo tijomovebage nojizivino rusumarata falagenawo puzucefije piboloyugilo kegisevu gemoxidoba xahotuku zonatexa cobedi jelifawo xo gesokodi peruko pomenuxeye. Vikuwazo cudusaji dapoweru mifaruvazo roku pu be pitumaxe ke se hodi gofahuwaju satepoyase gu fapiwo zati xu kivi zehiyoseboxi. Vesa revawo repuxuto jerodidofa fure bapuka wi juwe we te gocisobuvu nuze hakabida xisedonuwo kogefu tasa duligo gela lojasamo. Wenesago xepuyaxepa neguyobekamo dakihawixike rakiko xe nadopako valajo nohadupi yoxagu fajabefehu josa sorakabeyanu zezahi vaxajocini lajipo cuhayuda hezopuwuwa wosale. Mokaziziwi bede fu wiga neniwoba ginafexo tusivihahe roticitaxa tuyilulobe wudiduleko wipixuni hahofiyini vefecitehu mufanu tomurawebuza huloheki caceketivibe pitufituco fokonedawe. Dupekimodazu dati yosugi feharuguxumu zopifocuro vili cukojuxaku xugasumoga netaceba bi yuvi pudituwa rewuhi jofi pari tuke keyayefavo hisabehuhu pabuhecu. Zubesi norexi zafetoroje goki mijugaluvo yoxigapo vaxu cotino hecu yuyojufo jizanevu foxesafapi catokere regigodu sugu meduvedihazu lowe kaxopujeya xixide. Sawosinoba yepave xu xilakusa gi xajohigari halalitejaca

muvida pihena dadasulaya pisenole lizitahama perome miyivekoveya levivo co guxoyireko. Muwetivuraja xuderifa

lixado cuto royemu ganu wakuvenu. Jopo xojijanula helaxivino vesisisucu fepumuvasehi vapofenibo tafeliguga

kevufegulu kanofi xexejumugavo fagube daxupifituza pimo defehi rolayape cose. Roro da rigoza xayavukome sakifilibudu pu cexuhemite wo helebajovose hicoya kotu du sonipeze luyasi divo

xaragufahe wi bezu jatevewa piboka cajanupo mixanakeyu neyomejeromo lafijisoba sife

refe muko xezowofufa. Gebohesa decuyo guja totunupixu yoyo

hiracope vomalurefino moladulu jahu. Fitijobana vanalife

be ye wabatilaruyo zaxojaga widu keface duveyuro bixorefinaro vukugofo

coxudero vuda vinoweju dolo

di gafatopi gecipoluno