

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION: A TOOL OF DISPENSING JUSTICE IN INDIA

Gaurav Singh*

Abstract

Without openness and participation of citizens of the country, democracy is ineffective and worthless. To enable citizens to actively participate in governance, they should be provided with information regarding governmental activities, about their elected representatives, about bureaucrats, about benefits which are conferred on citizens in various walks of life and information about governance itself. Equitable, fair, transparent and justice ridden administration presupposes that persons be made aware of the Law, Rules, Regulations and Administrative guidelines by which their affairs will be governed. The Right to Information (RTI) Act, 2005 is designed to set up a practical regime for citizens to access information available with public authorities, in order to promote transparency and accountability in their working. The Act provides for the constitution of the Central Information Commission (CIC) to be responsible for the implementation of the Act, exercising powers conferred on it under Section 18 of the Act. The objective of the Research paper is, the need and importance of the right to information, And To examine the efficacy of central information commission as a body which lends force to the provisions of Right to information act and extent to which it helps in the dispensation of justice in cases of applicant seeking information from a recalcitrant body. Other objective is to see how far the central information commission has been played a vital or effective role in providing justice to the information seeker and to look into the role of Central Information Commission in implementation of Right to Information Act. The contribution of the Central Information Commission the development of RTI law is no less important. This has been elaborately discussed in paper with the relevant decisions handed down by the Commission from time to time. Central Information Commission is such a statutory body which creates system by which access to justice becomes accessible to people of this country. Access to justice is pre-requisite to administration of justice; hence Central Information Commission is a means to attain administration of justice in India.

Keywords: RTI, CIC, Administration etc.

* Advocate @ Allahabad High Court, Allahabad (U.P.) Email: gauravsinghdu@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The traditional state governance, Public Administration and mechanical application of laws in a routine way have now become completely irrelevant in the modern system of governance and public transactions. In the absence of access of information, the constitutional mandate for freedom of speech and expression enshrined in information was denied to the citizens, in the name of secrecy and confidentiality in government deal, which resulted in violation of basic human right of the people to have access to information which is implicit Article 21.

In a Democratic country ‘Right to information’ can be regarded as a paramount and cardinal principle of constitutional jurisprudence. Several democratic countries have enacted various rational and functional legislations towards the essential requirements to accelerate the momentum of right to information in purpose-oriented direction in Indian perspective, so there is an urgent need to provide for adequate and practical legislation on this pivotal issue of right to information.

At the International level, the Right to information finds articulation as an inalienable fundamental human right in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. At the regional level, there are numerous other human rights documents like, The Commonwealth, The African Charter on Human and People’s Rights, Council of Europe, which include access to information as a fundamental human right.

The growing importance of right to information as an inseparable from truly participatory democracy, led the Indian Parliament to bring out the Right in Information Act in 2005, which makes the beginning of a new era for appreciable scope of transparency and accountability in the administration system of government.

Central Information Commission’s vigil and promptness in handling RTI cases and their speedy disposal have substantially contributed to the development of the RTI Act. CIC is also playing a very significant role to achieve the goal of “maximum disclosure and minimum secrecy” in order to promote openness and accountability in administration.

A perusal of decisions and ruling of the CIC over the past 12 years would reveal that right to information means more opportunities for citizen to access to information. The RTI applications are often seen by the officials as attempts to expose corruption, poor governance,

mal-practice etc. It hardly needs to be stated that conferment of RTI by itself does not bring about growth and development of knowledge unless the process of dissemination of information is managed and monitored effectively. The Central Information Commission is handling this task with a unified approach to addressing concerns about the use and potential abuse of information dissemination.

The paper deals with the role of CIC to enforce the right to information and how it has helped in the dispensation of justice by its decisions.

OBJECTIVE OF THE RESEARCH

The study would an attempt to bring into sharp focus, the need and importance of the right to information, the way right to information has been chiselled and honed by the judiciary in Indian and the way it has been statutorily recognized in India by way of Right to Information Act 2005 And To examine the efficacy of central information commission as an body which lends force to the provisions of Right to information act and extent to which it helps in the dispensation of justice in cases of applicant seeking information from a recalcitrant body.

Other objective is to see how far the central information commission has been played a vital or effective role in providing justice to the information seeker and to look into the role of Central Information Commission in implementation of Right to Information Act.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this paper researcher has adopted Doctrinal methodology which is also known as non-empirical. Researcher has also adopted the Exploratory Research form in this thesis Various journals, websites, literature, directories has been referred for generating initial information on the subject. This study use basically Primary sources like, Constitution of India, Indian Statues, rules and regulations; reports of the Working Committees, decisions given by the information commission.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature reviewed under this section relates to the importance of Right to Information, role of various segments of government and society in its use and implementation, obstacles and challenges in its implementation; and suggestions for its proper and effective implementation. Various books, journal's, case laws have been analysed.

RESEARCH QUESTION

A sincere and dedicated effort has been made by the researcher to address the following questions in the current thesis which would be helpful in doing research and provide a framework.

- What is the contribution of Central Information Commission to implement and achieve the goal of RTI Act?
- Whether the process of Dissemination of information is managed and monitored effectively by the Central Information Commission?
- What is the scope of Public Authority under Section 2(h)? Whether political parties should be included under the scope of Public authority?

ROLE OF INDIAN JUDICIARY IN DEVELOPMENT OF RTI

Judiciary is the watchdog and custodian of Constitution also It draws the boundaries of the public authority functioning. There was no legal right to information and our Constitution as it does not use the expression 'freedom of information' in Art. 19. It was through a creative interpretation by Apex court of Article 19(1)(a) which carved out 'Right to information' as being implicit in the right to free speech and expression. Judiciary in several landmark cases has expressly held that 'Right to information' as natural concomitant of Article 19 (1)(a) and Article 21 of Constitution.

Supreme Court laid emphasis on the people's Right to know in case of *Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras*¹, The seeds of right to information were sowed in the landmark judgment of *State of Punjab v. Sodhi Sukhdev Singh*². The Supreme Court in a historical judgment provided the voter's right to know the antecedents of the candidates, which is utmost importance in democracy, in *Union of India v. Association for Democratic Reforms*³ In this case scope of Article 19 (1) (a) was widened and court affirmed that the right to know of the candidate contesting election to a House of Parliament or a state legislature or a panchayat or a municipal corporation is a precondition to the exercise of a citizen's right to vote. In, *Reliance Petrochemicals Ltd. v. Indian Express Newspapers Bombay (P) Ltd*⁴ court

¹ AIR 1950 SC 594

² AIR 1960 SC 554

³ AIR 2002 SC 2112

⁴ AIR 1988 SC 1208

recognized the right to know as emanating from the right to life and stated that, “We must remember that the people at large have a right to know in order to be able to take part in a participatory development in the industrial life and democracy. Right to know is a basic right which citizens of a free country aspire in the broader horizon of the right to live in this age on our land under Article 21 of our Constitution”.

Judiciary can be said to be the backbone of the right to information in India as it has vehemently supported the principles of transparency and accountability in all spheres of governance and played a vital role in interpreting the right to information.

VARIOUS ASPECTS OF RTI ACT

The Right to Information Act which came into effect in October 2005 covers Governments on all levels, Central, State or local along with all bodies owned, controlled or substantially financed, including Non- Governmental Organizations directly or indirectly financed by Appropriate Governments. This revolutionary enactment aims to ensure transparency and accountability in the working of every public authority, the right of any citizen of India to request access to information and the corresponding duty of the Government to meet the request, the duty of the Government to pro-actively make available key information to all, citizens, Non-Governmental Organizations and media. However, there are certain items that would be exempt from disclosure, e.g. sensitive information, access to which could prejudicially affect the sovereignty and integrity of India, the security, strategic, scientific or economic interests of the State relation with foreign States or lead to incitement of an offence.

This Act has a Preamble, six chapters divided into 31 sections and two schedules. Preamble along with the Statement of Objects and Reasons appended to it reflects the objectives of this Act.

- *Chapter-I* contains short title and dictionary clause.
- *Chapter-II* which is heart and soul of this Act contains Sections 3 to 11, which deal with citizens’ right to information and obligation of public authorities.
- *Chapter-III* contains Sections 12 to 14, which deals with constitution of Central Information Commission, its terms of office, conditions of service and procedure for removal in respect of the Chief Information Commissioner or the Information Commissioner.

- *Chapter-IV* contains Sections 15 to 17, which similarly deals with constitution of State Information Commission at State level, its terms of office, conditions of service and procedure for removal in respect of the State Chief Information Commissioner or the State Information Commissioner.
- *Chapter-V* contains Sections 18 to 20, which describes the powers and functions of such commissions, procedure for appeal and power to impose penalties.
- *Chapter-VI* contains Sections 21 to 31, which contains miscellaneous provisions wherein Section 22 gives overriding effect to the provisions of this Act over any other law for the time being in force. Section 23 puts a bar on jurisdiction of Courts. Section 24 makes provisions for exemptions of certain intelligence and security organizations, which are specified in Second Schedule, from the provisions of this Act except information pertaining to the allegations of corruptions and human rights violation. Sections 27 and 28 empower the appropriate Government and competent authority respectively to make rules.
- The First Schedule contains form of oath or affirmation to be made by the Chief Information commissioner/The Information Commissioner/the State Chief Information Commissioner/The State Information Commissioner.

The Second Schedule contains the list of 22 intelligence and security organizations which are exempted from the provisions of this Act except information pertaining to the allegations of corruptions and human rights violations. Right to Information Act provides that all citizens shall have the right to information (Section-3 refers). Information according to its Section-2(f) means:- Any material in any form, Records, Documents, Memos, E-mails, Opinions, Advices, Press releases, Circulars, Orders, Logbooks, Contracts, Reports, Papers, Samples, Models, Data material held in any electronic form, and Information relating to any private body which can be accessed by a public authority under any other law for the time being in force.

Right to Information Act, 2005, has been seen as the key to strengthen participatory democracy and promoting people-centric governance. It is a boon for a country like India which is having growth of corruption, lack of public accountability, bureaucratic indifference and numerous other ills. The main aim is to bring citizens close to governance by informed citizenry, transparency in administration as well as public accountability and minimizing corruption as under this Act every citizen has a right to receive and impart information. The

State is not only under an obligation to respect this right of the citizens, but equally under an obligation to ensure conditions under which this right can be meaningfully and effectively enjoyed by one and all. This right includes right to acquire information and to disseminate and it is necessary for self-expression, which is an important means of free conscience and self-fulfilment. It enables people to contribute on social and moral issues. It is the best way to find a truest model of anything, since it is only through it that the widest possible range of ideas can be circulated. Therefore, the Right to Information Act, if used and implemented prudently, has the potential to set good governance and to make the governmental system more responsive towards citizens of the country.

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

The object behind the establishment of a Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission seems to be that proceedings in a Civil Court would be more time consuming and also keep the persons for whose benefit the Act is intended, engaged in the pursuit of litigation for a good part of their time, which they could have otherwise employed more usefully in their legitimate occupation and that such proceedings would be more expensive and would eat away the great part of the return of their labour. It is with this object of the Act to set up such a Commission which would create more confidence and a greater sense of security in the minds of the citizens. Chapter III of the Right to Information Act, 2005, deals with Central Information Commission at the Centre Level. The central organization which control and monitors all authorities created under the Act to make service of supplying information to the citizens is the Central Information Commission at the Centre Level and the State Information Commission at the State Level. The various provisions concerning the constitution of the Central Information Commission (CIC) are as follows:

Section 12(3) of the RTI Act provides that The Chief Information Commissioner and Information Commissioners shall be appointed by the President on the recommendation of a committee consisting of:

- I. The Prime Minister, who shall be the Chairperson of the committee;
- II. The Leader of Opposition in the Lok Sabha; and
- III. A Union Cabinet Minister to be nominated by the Prime Minister.

Section 12(5) of the RTI Act provides that the Chief Information Commissioner and Information Commissioners shall be persons of eminence in public life with wide knowledge

and experience in law, science and technology, social service, management, journalism, mass media or administration and governance.

It must not be forgotten that any legislation would fail if the enforcement mechanism is not fully equipped and is not given adequate powers. Without adequate powers, it would be like a paper lion or a toothless tiger. For the successful implementation of the RTI Act, it is very important that due care should be taken to maintain the integrity, sovereignty and independence of the Information Commissions and that they are provided adequate powers.

The petitions can be filed before the Information Commissions in two ways (i) as a complaint and (ii) as an appeal. The complaints are filed under section 18 and whereas appeals are filed under section 19(3) of the RTI Act respectively. Section 18(1) of the Act says that it shall be the duty of the Central Information Commission or State Information Commission, as the case may be, to receive and inquire into a complaint from any person. Moreover, the complaint is a kind of grievance filed before the Information Commission by the person, who had requested information under the RTI Act but has not been able to get it because of the Non Appointment of Public Information Officer, Refusal to Accept Application, Refusal to Access to Information, No Response to Request, No Proper Information has been provided.

Section 18(2) of the Act provides that the Central or State Information Commission may initiate an inquiry in respect thereof if he is satisfied that the reasonable grounds exist to inquire into the matter. The Central or State Information Commission, as the case may be, while inquiring into any matter under this section, shall have the same powers as are vested in a civil court while trying a suit under the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, in respect of the following matters, namely:

- summoning and enforcing the attendance of persons and compel them to give oral Or written evidence on oath and to produce the documents or things;
- requiring the discovery and inspection of documents;
- receiving evidence on affidavit;
- requisitioning any public record or copies thereof from any court or office;
- issuing summons for examination of witnesses or documents; and any other matter which may be prescribed.

MAJOR DECISIONS OF CIC

Political party as a public authority

In *Subhash Chandra Aggarwal & Ors v. Indian National Congress (INC)/All India Congress Committee (AICC) Ors*⁵, the Commission held that INC/AICC, BJP, CPI, CPI (M), NCP and BSP have been substantially financed by the Central Government under section 2(h)(ii) of the RTI Act. The criticality of the role being played by these political parties in our democratic set up and the nature of duties performed by them also point towards their public character, bringing them in the ambit of section 2(h) of the Act. The constitutional and legal provisions also point towards their character as public authorities. Complaint No. CIC/MISC/2009/0001 and CIC/MISC/2009/0002 is hereby set aside and it is held that INC/AICC, BJP, CPI, CPI (M), NCP and BSP are public authorities under section 2(h) of the RTI Act. Besides, the Presidents/General Secretaries of the above mentioned political parties are also directed to comply with the provisions of section 4(1)(b) of the RTI Act by way of making voluntary disclosures on the subjects mentioned in the said clause. The Commission further observed that there is need for accountability and transparency in the functioning of the political parties.

It said that Political Parties are Substantially Financed by the Central Government because there was indirect financing of Political Parties by allotment of large tracts of land to them in prime areas of Delhi or state capital either, free of cost, or at concessional rates. There was accommodation facility at concessional rates and there was total tax exemption. Moreover, they play a critical role in our democratic set up and the nature of duties performed by them also point towards their public character, bringing them in the ambit of section 2(h). These are the unique institutions, as they come to wield directly or indirectly influence on the exercise of governmental power. It would be odd to argue that transparency is good for all State organs but not so good for Political Parties, which, in reality, control all the vital organs of the State.

Although the CIC directed the parties to appoint CPIOs within a period of six months, nothing as such happened. The battle for political parties to be included in the ambit of RTI has got little tougher. The central government has filed an affidavit before the Supreme Court that political parties need not be brought under the ambit of RTI act. The government has said that bringing parties in the ambit would lead to hampering of smooth functioning of the political parties. It also has submitted that order of the central information commission in

⁵ Complaint No CIC/SM/C/2011/001386 and CIC/SM/C/2011/000838, Dated 3rd June, 2011

2013 declaring political parties as public authorities under the RTI act was erroneous. All major political parties, except AAP, have also expressed similar views. The case is sub judice before the Supreme Court.

Regarding Degree of Narendra Modi

In *Neeraj Saxena v. District Election Officer, GNCTD*⁶ The Central Information Commission has directed the PIOs of Delhi University and Gujarat University, Ahmadabad to make best possible search for the information regarding degrees in the name of Mr. Narendra Damodar Modi in the year 1978 (Graduation in DU).

The educational qualifications related information about public authority or public servant or political leader occupying constitutional position is not hit by any exception under Section 8 of RTI Act. It cannot be stated as personal or private information also. In fact, the information about educational degrees of Prime Minister is already in public domain. It is a matter of profuse reporting in print, electronic and social media. In an interview to a senior journalist, Mr Rajiv Shukla, Mr Shukla, Mr Narendra Modi explained that he completed High School and on the advice of an elderly personality he obtained degree and PG through external examinations without stepping into the colleges". "Not prescribing the educational qualification for contesting electoral offices is one of the great features of Indian Democracy. What needed is education not degrees".

Consequently, The Central Information Commission (CIC) has slapped a fine of Rs 25,000 on the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO) of Delhi University (DU) for rejecting an RTI application seeking Prime Minister Narendra Modi's graduation degree. The Information Commissioner, M. Sridhar Acharyulu, in a recent order, pulled up DU CPIO Meenakshi Sahay had said the rejections reminded him of the saying "penny wise, pound foolish".

However, Delhi HC's stay order was passed after Delhi University filed a plea challenging the CIC order, on grounds that the order was "arbitrary and capricious (and) is also untenable in law". The university, represented by Additional Solicitor General of India Tushar Mehta, contended that inspection of the records cannot be allowed, as details of roll number, father's name and marks obtained is "personal information" that cannot be released to a third party.

⁶ CIC/SA/C/2015/000275

Mehta also told the court that “universities hold the subject information in fiduciary capacity and as such the same is an excepted information under Section 8(e) and (j) of RTI Act”.

CONCERN OF CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION ON DELAY IN SUPPLYING INFORMATION

In *Shri Amit Ghosh v. Department of Pension & Pensioners Welfare (DoP & PW), New Delhi*, a perusal of the comments submitted by both the CPIO and Appellate Authority, it is apparent that there is a comprehensive delay in responding to the request of the complainant. The Commission observed default in registering the application received under the RTI Act on the part of the CPIO, Ms. Geetha Nair, Under Secretary, DOP & PW. The Commission views this seriously. Nevertheless there is a reasonable cause for the delay resulting from an office lapse, and in the light of the implied acquiesce of complainant detailed in the 3 paragraph below, no penalty will lie. However, as assured by the CPIO and the appellate Authority, the Commission directed DOP&PW, to exercise greater care in processing such cases in future. On the other hand, the complainant has not filed any rebuttal to the plea taken by the CPIO and appellate authority, which may be presumed as an indication of the satisfaction.

In the case of, *Shri. P.H. Tare v. CPIO M/o Defence RTI Cell, DRDO, Armament Research And Development Estt. (ARDE), Pune, Maharashtra*⁷, The appellant levelled allegation against the then Director ARDE, Shri A M Datar of corruption charges.

During the hearing the appellant submitted that the then Director ARDE was involved in corrupt practices. Hence, information is disclosable. The CPIO claimed that DRDO is exempted u/s 24(1) of the RTI Act. There were Transport allowance claim of Rs 19,200/- for which he got exemption for Rs 4800 for the period of 2010-11 and again TA claim of Rs 19,200/- for which he got exemption for Rs 9600 for the year 2011-12. Therefore, the proviso to Sec 24(1) is applicable in this case as there was prima facie evidence of wrongdoing. In the decision ,Commission find it logical to direct the present CPIO, DRDO, Shri Kulkarni to provide point wise information as available on record to the appellant within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order.

INFORMATION OF PENSION FALL WITHIN AMBIT OF SEC 7(I)

⁷ CIC/CC/A/2015/001781-AB

In case of *Amrika Bai v. PIO, EPFO, Raipur*⁸, RTI applications seeking pension details should be replied to within 48 hours as it pertains to the 'life and liberty' of the elderly, the Central Information Commission has held as it pitched for early redressal of such grievances. The Commission also directed that if an RTI application is a genuine grievance of a pensioner, steps should be initiated within 48 hours to redress it. The directive of Information Commissioner Sridhar Acharyulu will come to the aid of over 58 lakh central government pensioners.

Commission held that the information pertaining to pension of a person pertains to his/her life and liberty which is mandated to be replied to within 48 hours as per the Right to Information (RTI) Act. He said the moment an RTI application on pension issue is received, there should be a mechanism at the entry stage to discover and identify if it reflects a pension related grievance. He said it should be brought to the notice of the responsible officer by the CPIO on the same day and if it is a genuine case, the grievance should be addressed. The result should be communicated within 48 hours, followed by redressal within 30 days.

RECOMMENDATION

With the enactment of the RTI Act, India has moved from an opaque and secretive system of Government towards the greater transparency and accountability where the citizen will be empowered because by empowering the ordinary citizens a nation can progress. If the RTI Act has to fulfil its goal and not to become an ornamental document only, constant public vigilance on all important public matters would be essential. However, there are certain deficiencies in fulfilling the legal obligations by the Government and its Public Authorities have restricted the free flow of information. To make the law an effective instrument of empowerment and to usher in an era of transparency and accountability so as to fulfil the goals and objective of the Constitution, the some following Recommendations may prove to be useful:

- To ensure the independence, autonomy and competence of the Information Commissioners, the process of selection must be transparent. Specific qualifications like background of law should be mentioned under the eligibility conditions as is done in the appointments under other legislations. Commission is discharging a very crucial and key role, so it is become very essential that the members of the

⁸ CIC/BS/A/2016/001238

Commission must possess outstanding educational qualifications, brilliance and remarkable experience in the field of selection, administration and recruitment etc. Of utmost importance, they should work freely and without any political influence.

- The CIC or the SIC in its decision or in general can give directions to the public authorities to take such steps to secure compliance with the provisions of the RTI Act. A strict time limit should be for following those directions failing which some penalty should be imposed and there is also need to mention the time limit or certain date for suo moto disclosure of information by agencies as given in the Act.
- In order to make effective implementation of the RTI act there is a need to enhance the penalties and should be made deterrent provision for wilfully defaulting officer and PIO/APIO. The proper implementation of section 20 should be done by the Information commission in the cases of wilful defaulting and the quantum of fine should be raised from Rs.250 per day to Rs.1000 per day and maximum limit be raised from Rs.25000 to Rs.100000 which would secure the avoidance of the delay in information.
- Various departments of the central government are placed in across the country and in every state, so it easy for the SIC to provide support to CIC for the speedy disposal of the case. The cooperation between the information commissions would lead to in an effective result of knowledge delivery. There should be a mechanism by which the authorities and functionaries of the state and centre can be monitored effectively and in case of non-discloser of the information, responsibility may be fixed of respective authority. For developing better coordination and cooperation between CIC and SIC's there should be an appropriate institution be placed and annual meetings of these bodies may take place to discuss their issues.
- The culture of suo moto discloser of information by public authorities should be promoted and maximum information should be made available without any specific request of citizens. Each Government department and public institution must make available full, adequate and complete information about its structure, types of service, limitation of time in grievance redressal etc. Above said information should provide on its official website, notice board as well as via poster etc.
- For the grass root involvement of the citizens in general and deprived or disadvantaged people in particular Right to information cells with the government officials and with the help of civil society at the grass root level. These Designated cells should repeatedly crosscheck the methodology of public authorities function at

district level and concurrently introduce predictor of performance to the state government about curative action which requires to be taken periodically.

- CIC should be equipped with some more power like contempt of court, having consisted of eminent jurist and retired judges and for the speedy disposal of pending appeal more members can be introduced in SICs and CIC.
- It is pertinent to mention that the withdrawal of application must be restricted in the matter seeking information by a public authority, as it may lead to a miscarriage to a justice system so adopted, which may further lead to bargaining and in our judicial institution.

CONCLUSION

The RTI Act was enacted to secure access to information held by public authorities and government in order to enhance accountability and transparency. It enables to create accountable and responsible governance and also a mechanism to establish a better balance between power holder and controller of information vis-a-vis information seeking citizens who are both the beneficiary and author of democracy.

Central Information Commission has played a very vital role to minimize corruption as we have seen in many decision given by the CIC for example in Augstawestland chopper scam case, the order had been given by CIC to defence ministry to disclose paper of it .Further many scams have come into light by the relevant information enforced by CIC and it also bring the Political parties to within the ambit of ‘public authority’. However the case is sub judice in apex court.

A perusal of decisions of the CIC over the past 11 years would reveal that right to information means greater opportunities in order to access the information. The RTI applications are often seen by the public authorities as a step to expose corruption, poor governance, scams, mala fide practices etc. The conferment of RTI Act by itself does not evolve growth and development of information unless and until the process of dissemination of information is well managed and properly monitored. The Central Information Commission is performing the object of the aforesaid act with a dignified manner and unified approach in addressing concerns about the better use and likelihood abuse of information dissemination.

With the enactment of the Right to Information Act, India has taken a great leap forward to achieve real Swaraj. Active and Responsible citizens would be able to make optimum utilization of the aforesaid act. It is a significant step in the proper direction by opening windows for all. The Fragrance of it is bound to dissipate slowly but definitely, but the stink of confidentiality & abuse of power should not be too strong as the fragrance of Right to Information & transparency is not absorbed-in-toto. Its territorial jurisdiction should not be limited to only India, it must spread in Bharat also, then only difference between Haves vs. have not would be eliminated. That will ensure that the Government in this democratic set up is not merely '*of the people and by the people*', but is also consist of most essential part '*for the people*'.

Therefore, "*Central Information Commission is the means and RTI is the end*". It is well known that the success of the end is depends upon the how fair and effective the mean is. To achieve pious objective of the RTI Act, CIC must be equipped as well as possessed with higher degree of transparency and autonomy in order to become a dignified statutory, quasi-judicial adjudicator.

Hence, having discussed and understood the various provisions of the RTI Act and the decisions given by the CIC, it is clear that the CIC is the base of the aforesaid act and it has properly provided the objective of Information disseminating system in order to dispense justice to the citizens. Further, for the better enforcement of the RTI Act, CIC has to be more strengthen.