

Central Information Commission

Mr.Anupam Sharma vs State Bank Of India on 12 May, 2010

Central Information Commission

File No.CIC/SM/A/2009/001023 dated 29-01-2009

Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (19)

Dated: 12 May 2010

Name of the Appellant	:	Shri Anupam Sharma Purana Baraf Khana, Near Railway Crossing, Uswan Road, Budaun.
Name of the Public Authority	:	CPIO, State Bank of India, Local Head Office, Lucknow.

The Appellant was present in person.

On behalf of the Respondent, Shri S. Mitra was present.

2. In this case, the Appellant had, in his application dated 29 January 2009, requested the CPIO, Tikatganj to provide him copies of documents in regard to a number of queries regarding the role and responsibility of the guarantor in loan cases etc. In his reply dated 24 February 2009, the Branch Manager offered several clarifications/explanation/information against these queries. Not satisfied with the reply of the CPIO, the Appellant preferred an appeal. The Appellate Authority disposed of the appeal in his order dated 22 April 2009 in which he directed the CPIO to provide the desired information along with copies of the relevant circulars/rules. Reportedly, the CPIO, in compliance of these directions, had sent the desired information to the Appellant in his communication dated 5 May 2009. Now the Appellant has come to the CIC alleging that he had been provided with wrong information and that the Branch Manager should be punished for that.

CIC/SM/A/2009/001023

3. We heard this case through videoconferencing. The Appellant was present in the Badaun studio of the NIC while the Respondents were present in the Lucknow studio. We heard their submissions. Although the Appellant had

not framed his requests very clearly, nevertheless, it is quite obvious that the Appellant had sought copies of the circulars/guidelines on sanction of car loan in general and about his own loan case in particular. In fact, the Appellate Authority had already directed the CPIO to provide the copies of all the relevant rules and regulations covering the queries of the Appellant, which it seems he did not provide. Therefore, we now direct the CPIO to provide to the Appellant within 10 working days from the receipt of this order, (a) the relevant rules and regulations laying down the eligibility criteria and the documentation details for availing of car loan and (b) the photocopy of the relevant records of the Branch showing the reasons for the rejection of his car loan application.

4. We have noted that the Appellate Authority had observed that the Branch Manager had disposed of the requests for information even though he was not authorised to do so. If he was not authorised to deal with such requests, he should have transferred the application promptly to the designated CPIO. We would expect the CPIO to advise the Branch Manager concerned suitably so that he does not repeat the mistake in future.

5. With the above directions, the appeal is disposed off.

6. Copies of this order be given free of cost to the parties.

(Satyananda Mishra) Information Commissioner CIC/SM/A/2009/001023
Authenticated true copy. Additional copies of orders shall be supplied against application and payment of the charges prescribed under the Act to the CPIO of this Commission.

(Vijay Bhalla) Assistant Registrar CIC/SM/A/2009/001023