Name of the Appellant: Shri. R.C. Jena

Name of the Public Authority: Department of Posts

Facts:

1. The appellant could not avail of the opportunity of personal hearing on 10/9/2007. The appeal is, therefore, examined on merit.

2. The appellant, an employee of the respondent, had asked for disclosure of certain information relating to a colleague, who is identified in his application. The information sought relate to promotion, disciplinary action and award of punishment, etc., to the concerned employee. The CPIO and the appellate authority have furnished partial information, while a part of information have been denied u/s 8(1)(j) of the Act, on the ground that the disclosure of information is not in public interest.

3. Being unsatisfied with the responses, he has challenged the decisions of the CPIO and the appellate authority.

Decision:

4. Most public authorities, especially the organizations like the respondent, which have considerable interface with the citizens, have not done enough to promote education and training u/s 26 of the Act, to create awareness about the proper and effective use of the RTI Act. As a result, a large number of information seekers, including the delinquent employees of government departments, have been misusing the provisions of the RTI Act. To an extent, use or misuse by the public servants may be tolerable, if they are affected by any public action. But, many a time, a requester is more interested in the affairs of other colleagues without any justifiable reasons, rather than himself, as in the instant case. In doing so, they mis-use office infrastructure for seeking information rather than devoting adequate time and energy for providing mandatory public services of high quality. Such employees, at the cost of public
resources merely promote personal interest which tantamount to a serious nature of mis-use of the Act. The present appeal falls in such a category of mis-use of the Act by a public servant, who has sought to know the details of service related information about another colleague, mainly for promotion of his personal interest.

5. Will the respondent educate them u/s 26 of the Act, if not, in any other legal provisions?

6. This appeal is indeed frivolous and is thus disposed of.

Sd/-
(Prof. M.M. Ansari)
Information Commissioner
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1. Shri. R.C. Jena, IPO (PG), Department of Posts, Office of the S.S.P.Os, Sundargarh Division, Sundargarh – 770 001.

2. Shri. B.C. Sethy, Supdt. of Post Offices & PIO, Department of Posts, Office of the Superintendent of Post Offices, Sambalpur Division, Sambalpur – 768 001.