

# Central Information Commission

\*\*\*\*\*

No.CIC/OK/A/2006/00268-272.

Dated: 29 December 2006

Name of the Appellant : Shri S.K. Lal,  
725/2, N.H-IV,  
Faridabad - 121 001

Name of the Public Authority : Ministry of Railways

## Background:

Five appeals as detailed below were filed by the Appellant, Shri S.K. Lal of Faridabad, with the Ministry of Railways on 7<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> of February 2006 and 14<sup>th</sup> of March 2006. These cases were taken together at the hearing by the Commission as the issues involved were identical in nature.

2. Not satisfied by the response of the Respondents in all these appeals, the Appellant filed his second appeal before this Commission.
3. The Commission decided to hold a hearing on the issues involved on 27 December 2006.
4. During the hearing, the Respondents were represented by Shri B.L. Meena, Executive Director (P.G) & P.I.O, Dr. Hanuman Singh, Executive Director (Health), Shri Jaswant Rai, E.D.E and Ms. Mamta Kandwal, DDE (ER).
5. The Appellant sent a written message that since he was pre-occupied, he was deputing Shri Bhupendra Kumar in his place.
6. The hearing related to five different cases filed by Shri S.K. Lal before the Railways. As the Appellant and the Respondents were the same, the Commission decided to club all the five cases together. The observation and the decision of the Commission in all the five appeals are reproduced below, case by case:

## Appeal No. 268

7. The Appellant vide his application to the P.I.O. on 7 February 2006 asked

for “**all the records** related with the allocation of different services and departments to the selected candidates of the Engineering Services Examination, 2002 whose final result came in 2003.”

Appeal No. 270

8. Similarly in his application vide case No. 270, the Appellant asked for “**all the records** related with the process of appointment of Dr. Uma Verma at the post of DMO (General Medicine) selected through UPSC Result-2001/17/10183/2001-I published in Employment News dated 10-16 Aug, 2002, and records of everything related with her on this issue till date”.

Appeal No. 271

9. Again vide his application under Appeal No.271, the Appellant asked for (i) “**all the records** related with the regulations of Indian Railways’ staff, officers and employees in whatever capacity. (ii) Indian Railway Medical Manual 2000, and other manuals or records related with the regulations of Railways’ Medical Staff.”

Appeal Nos. 269 & 272

10. Again in his case Nos. 269 & 272, the Appellant has asked for the following:

“i) A brief sketch of around five- pages about the Indian Railway’s Health and Medical Establishments.

ii) **Names, Complete addresses, Telephone numbers- both Railways’ as well as BSNL or of other service providers, of all the Railways’ Hospitals and other Health Centers within the territory of U.P. along with the names, designations, qualifications, telephone numbers and the category (SC, ST, OBC or General) of all the doctors working in them.**

iii) **Names, Complete addresses, Telephone numbers- both Railways’ as well as BSNL or of other service providers, of all the Hospitals within the territory of U.P. in which the posts of DMO (Specialist-Cadre) exist, with the number of such posts with Specialty in each such Hospital, and whether they are filled or vacant, along with the names, designations, qualifications, telephone numbers and the category (SC, ST, OBC or General) of all the doctors working in them against each such post.**

iv) **Category-wise distribution of all the doctors working in all the**

## **Railways' Hospitals within the territory of U.P.”**

### **Decision:**

11. The Commission noted that the Respondents in several cases had acted positively on the demands made by the Appellants. However, even a casual look at the long list of varied information asked for by the Appellant would make it clear that the information asked for is frivolous and even bordering on the absurd. In most of the cases, the Appellant has asked for ALL THE RECORDS regarding various services and categories of staff in the Railways which actually mean nothing and only amount to making a mockery of the Act. It must be remembered that though the Respondents are duty bound to supply information asked for by the Appellants, the Appellants are also required to keep in mind the objectives of the RTI Act as outlined in the Preamble to the Act: and that is, to introduce the elements of transparency and accountability in the functioning of the public authorities and to contain corruption. The Commission failed to appreciate how these objectives would be met with if the Appellant asked for such diverse and lengthy information which seemed to be designed only to put the public authorities under undue and uncalled for pressure. In this particular case, the Commission, in fact, appreciated the effort of the public authority to collect and provide as much information to the Applicant as possible and dismissed the case as frivolous and inconsequential.

12. The Commission ordered accordingly.

Sd/-  
(O.P. Kejariwal)  
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy:

Sd/-  
(Pankaj K.P. Shreyaskar)  
Assistant Registrar

Cc:

1. Shri S.K. Lal, 725/2, NH-IV, Faridabad-121001
2. Shri S.K. Nanda, Appellate Authority, Railway Board, Rail Bhawan, New Delhi-110011
3. Shri B.L. Meena, Central Public Information Officer, Railway Board, Rail Bhawan, New Delhi-110011
4. Officer Incharge, NIC
5. Press E Group, CIC