

**BEFORE THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND FIRST APPELLATE AUTHORITY  
INSOLVENCY AND BANKRUPTCY BOARD OF INDIA**

2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Jeevan Vihar Building  
Sansad Marg, New Delhi- 110 001

**Dated: 19<sup>th</sup> September, 2022**

**RTI Appeal Registration No. ISBBI/A/E/22/00040**

**IN THE MATTER OF**

**Yash Barvaliya**

... Appellant

Vs.

**Central Public Information Officer**

The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India

2nd Floor, Jeevan Vihar Building

Sansad Marg, New Delhi- 110 001.

... Respondent

**ORDER**

1. The Appellant has filed present Appeal dated 30<sup>th</sup> August 2022, challenging the communication of Respondent dated 29<sup>th</sup> August 2022 against the information requested by the Appellant *vide* his RTI Application No. ISBBI/R/E/22/00211 dated 27<sup>th</sup> August 2022 filed under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) wherein the Appellant had requested for the following –
  - (a) How many company and how much loan write off by insolvency of that company?
  - (b) How many company file bankruptcy (with company name)?
2. The Respondent has replied stating that the requested information is ‘*vague and unclear*’.
3. In this Appeal, the Appellant has stated that “*I WANT TO KNOW TO TILL DATE HOW MUCH AMOUNT WOULD BE WRITE OFF(FORGIVE) BY BANK TO COMPANY OR MULTINATIONAL COMPANY UNDER INSOLVENCY AND BANKRUPTCY BOARD OF INDIA WITH COMPANY NAME AND AMOUNT.*”
4. I have carefully examined the application, the response of the Respondent and the Appeal and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record. Upon a perusal of the query, I note that the same is vague. Further, it is difficult to ascertain what exact information has been sought by the Appellant. I am inclined to agree with the observation of the Respondent that the request for information made therein was vague and not specific and the same cannot be construed as seeking “*information*” as defined under section 2(f) of the RTI Act. The Appellant has not specified his exact information requirement to the Respondent. It is not clear as what the Appellant means by phrases like “*loan write off by insolvency*”, “*how much amount would be write off by bank... under Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India..*”, etc. In this context, I note that in the matter of *Shri S. C. Sharma vs. CPIO, Securities and Exchange Board of India* (Decision dated August 30, 2012), the Hon’ble CIC held: “*Since the Appellant had not clearly stated what exact information he wanted, the CPIO could not have provided any specific information to him. We would like to advise the Appellant that he might like to specify the exact information he wants from the SEBI and prefer a fresh application before the CPIO.*” Further, in the matter of *Shri Harmit Singh Vs. Central Excise Department, Chandigarh* (Order dated November 07, 2008) the Hon’ble CIC *inter alia* held that the respondents therein were right in rejecting the

request as it is quite unclear and vague and no specific information can be identified on the basis of the signals contained in this query.

5. In view of these observations, I find that the Respondent is not obliged to provide a response where the information sought is vague and not specific. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response.
6. The appeal is disposed of, accordingly.

**Sd/**  
**(Santosh Kumar Shukla)**  
First Appellate Authority

**Copy to:**

1. Appellant, Yash Barvaliya.
2. CPIO, The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Jeevan Vihar Building, Sansad Marg, New Delhi - 110 001.