वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान परिषद
COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC & INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH
अनुसंधान भवन, 2 रफी मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110001
Anusandhan Bhawan, 2, Rafi Marg, New Delhi-110001

सा°/No.: 5-1(126)/2009-PD

दिनांक/Dated: 19.02.2018

प्रेषक / From:

संयुक्त सचिव (प्रशासन)
Joint Secretary (Admn.)

सेवा में / To :

सी.एस.आई.आर के सभी राष्ट्रीय प्रयोगशालों/संस्थाओं/इकाईयों के निदेशक/प्रमुख/सीसीओ/सीपीआईओ/पीओओ
The Directors/Heads/CCOs/CPIOs/PIOs of all National Labs./Instts./Units of CSIR

महोदय/Sir / महोदया/Madam,

I am directed to forward herewith the decision of Central Information Commission dated 18.03.2016 bearing No. CIC/BS/A/2014/002319-SA passing a detailed decision in case of Mr. H.K. Bansal v. DoT, New Delhi on filling of Multiple RTIs/vague RTIs which divert considerable resources of the Public Authority and are often just to target the few officers thereby tarnishing the sacrosanct letter and spirit of RTI Act for information, guidance and compliance.

Hindi version will follow.

भवदीय/Yours faithfully,

-विनोद कुमार

(विनोद कुमार /Vinod Kumar)
अवर सचिव (नीति प्रभाग) / US(PD)

संलग्न/Encl. :यथोपरि/As above

प्रतिलिपि/Copy to:

1) Head, IT Division with the request to make this circular letter available on the website & Policy Repository.

2) कार्यालय प्रति/Office copy

Phone: EPABX-23710138, 23710144, 23710158, 23710468, 23710805, 23711251, 23714238, 23714249, 23714769, 23715303
Fax : 91-11-23714788, Gram : CONSEARCH, NEW DELHI, E-mail : jsa@csir.res.in

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

(Room No.315, B-Wing, August Kranti Bhawan, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi 110 066)

Prof. M. Sridhar Acharyulu (Madabhushi Sridhar)

Information Commissioner

CIC/BS/A/2014/002319-SA

(Video Conference – Rohtak)

H.K.Bansal v. DoT, New Delhi

RTI Application: 20-12-2012	1st Appeal: 29-7-2014	2nd Appeal: 25-9-2014
Observation: Harassing RTIs	Hearing: 07-01-2016	Decision date 18.3.2016

Parties present:

1. The appellant is not present for video conference at NIC Studio, Rohtak. The Public Authority represented by several officers of the DoT, from different wings of the public authority.

Background:

2. Mr. H. K. Bansal, a retired Engineer of the respondent authority, filed several RTI applications (more than 100) seeking various kinds of information including review DPC for the CE grade of P&T BW Grade-A service, happened long back. Some of his demands include copy of the notes on file on the basis of which the letter dated 13.12.2012 was issued, copy of the approval of telecom commission of June 1989 issued after which ACC approval is not being taken for the empanelment for the

appointment of officers to CE/CE/CA-grades of P and T BW Gr 'A' service, inspection of all the concerned files where this issue has been dealt with etc and also sought for information regarding D.O.T letter dated 13.12.12 regarding ACC approval aspect, etc.

3. The CPIO replied on 04.01.2013/14.01.2013/06.02.2013 and 29.07.2013. Claiming unsatisfied he filed First Appeal. The First Appellate Authority (FAA) directed CPIO on 14.05.2013 to supply the certified copies of the information sought by the appellant.

4. In compliance of FAA Order, CPIO on 28.06.2013 gave copy of the note sheets. Appellant complained that those were not properly attested copies because over the rubber stamp mark someone wrote 'certified copy', added below the undated signature, which was not admissible in evidence in a court of law. He also alleged that there were certain irregularities in the note sheet furnished to him. In every application he requests for early priority hearing because he is senior citizen.

5. To understand the nature of his RTI applications we need to refer to some of his information demands: Appeal No. 1281- copies of file notings, instructions etc on the basis of which so and so numbered letter is written. Like this he wanted details of ten letters in one RTI request. (This was transferred by CPIO to five sections of the public authority). No. 586: Similar details about disposal of letters written by him for his gratuity etc. He wanted huge information on seven points each which require some more documents. No. 48. Rules and instructions about discharge of functions of an officer in a post. Like that he wanted information about ten posts in one RTI application. No. 41. He asks such a question: What consideration (legal or illegal) taken from Shri VK Jain to extend favors to him? And then he wants all sorts of documents about him. He will choose some more names like that and then a dump of questions are posed. No. 1293 is his huge demand about Shri UN Srivastava. Appeal nos. 934 and 315 are

about Shri PK Panigrahi, and No.321, 264, 1316, 1432 are about complaints against him. No. 482 is about his grievances. He asks for prosecution of certain officers and then files RTI applications seeking action. Apart from considering each case separately, the Commission took an overall view on all the appeals filed by this appellant and passing this order, which shall also be considered part of orders passed in all second appeals heard today.

Contentions:

6. The appellant is not present for video conference at NIC studio, Rohtak. Several PIOs made their submissions. From the files, PIOs showed that the appellant was asking for information about the senior officers, repeatedly.

7. Officers explained background that Mr. H K Bansal has been filing multiple RTI application since his representation for promotion was not favored. In a written submission to the Commission, Mr. S. P. Mohapatra, Director (Civil) & CPIO, stated: Shri Bansal, a Retired S.E. (C) wanted promotion to the grade of Chief Engineer (Civil) on 20.5.2005 but his name was not considered in the DPC held on 18.05.2005 for selecting a panel for promotion to the grade of Chief Engineer (C) under the provisions of FR 35 due to non- availability of ACRs. After his permanent absorption in Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited (BSNL) Sri Bansal retired on 31.5.2007 as Superintending Engineer (Civil), on attaining the age of superannuation. Sri Bansal had submitted many representations on the same subject matter since 20.5.05. Those representations were considered and followed up in DPCs (30.9.2005 & 6.12.2005). The DPC concluded on 6.12.2005 "..... ***The DPC considered that the officer has deliberately not submitted self-appraisal wherever he felt that he may not get Very Good or outstanding as is clear from record. It amounts to indiscipline and willfully not submitted his self appraisal.*** .....DPC finds the officer not fit". The representations of Shri H.K. Bansal were also examined in detail and rejected at

various levels i.e, Member (T), Special Secretary (T) and Secretary (T). He was being regularly informed accordingly on decisions taken by the competent authorities. The fresh representation dt.9.3.15 of Shri H.K. Bansal has once again been considered and it has been decided to advise him to desist from making frequent representations on the same issue in light of DoP&T OM No. 11013/4/2010-Estt.A dated 19.4.2010. It was also informed to him by letter dt. 16.12.15. Non-consideration of promotion to the grade of Chief Engineer (civil) under provisions of FR 35 with respect to his juniors from the year 2005 resulted in a number of RTI applications on the same issue and they were responded from time to time till now. The latest information under RTI supplied to him was on again on the same subject on 04.01.2016.

8. The officers from different departments have contended that; they are frustrated and agonized at the number of representations are being repeatedly made followed by multiple and repeated RTI applications from appellant. Such applications are causing harassment to them individually and compelling the public authority to divert its resources to be engaged with the useless work created by the appellant, diverting office from deserving attention and seriously affecting the essential functioning of the public authority, they felt harassed because of this strange behavior of this applicant.

Issues before Commission:

9. These are some questions culled out of facts, material and the contentions before the Commission.

a) Whether multiple RTI applications like these amount to misuse?

b) Are there any restrictions on indiscriminate demand of huge information by present/former employee about other employees?

c) Can an employee use RTI to target colleagues, who complained or deposed against him in disciplinary proceedings or superior or took action

against him or did not select him for promotion? How to prevent harassment of public authority through misuse of RTI by its present or retired employees?

Analysis & Directions :

10. From the submissions of officers from public authority, it appears that they faced following problems:

a) Appellant repeats the representations and RTI applications on the same subject, i.e., he was denied 'due' promotion.

b) He used to raise several objections and issues from the reply given and uses them as basis for further RTI applications or appeals, using unreasonable language. Some of such letters are filed against the CIC office also. Most of RTI applications reveal that he picks up some letter numbers from earlier reply of public authority and then asks file-notings and other related documents around that letter without any rhyme or reason and purpose or logic. The officers have to spend a lot of time to understand the RTI application points which contains several names, reference numbers and files about at least four of five sections. His second appeals are also similarly drafted. He wants a portion of second appeal should be treated as complaint, but does not specify.

c) He demanded details of information about the seniors in DoT, who he thinks involved in denial of promotion or for some other reason or without any reason. For instance there are requests for information about service or orders or seniority of persons for instance, Mr. P. K. Panigrahi, Mr U.N. Srivastava, and others. Interestingly some of the information about these persons, which was exempted from disclosure, was given by the public authority. He generates some more RTI questions from out of responses.

d) To answer his questions several officers have to disproportionately divert their resources.

11. A mentally sound person or sane senior citizen will not generally engage in sadistic filing of frivolous RTI applications. It is not known why this senior citizen has targeted this public authority which he served, found livelihood in and enjoying pension benefits from. Suffering from torture was visible in officer's faces as they prayed the Commission to relieve them from the ***chakravyuh*** of RTI applications designed by appellant.

12. The Commission, having heard 16 (sixteen) appeals today, (H. K. Bansal v. Department of Telecommunications), observes that these repeated RTI applications were unreasonable and became a big problem for several sections of DoT and BSNL. His repeated representations and RTI applications about them on issue of rejection of his promotion by DPC long ago were already answered, were self-centric and devoid of any public interest, or not even a genuine grievance.

13. A reading of his RTI applications and appeals leads to an inference that his sole aim is to harass and torture but nothing else. Generally people use RTI for redressal of grievance, i.e., they state grievance or complaint and ask for action taken report. This is not that, because his grievance of denial of promotion was addressed several times. If he is aggrieved by rejection of promotion request, he is free to approach appropriate tribunal. Some highly educated citizens are using RTI to avenge against spouses, brothers or parents or colleagues or seniors etc. The appellant is a highly educated engineer with long experience, who became an advocate, but fully engaged in writing letters or RTI applications left, right and centre against his own department. The CPIOs of public authority responded with great patience, split his RTI questions, transferred, forwarded, struggled to file-note, issue notices, letters to get information and built huge number of files, some of which they have presented before the Commission. Lot of money and energy might have been spent on his applications so far, which if calculated would be more than Rs. 5 lakh, of public money. Neither appellant nor any other

person has any right to cause such wastage of public money and RTI is not meant to lead to such a loss.

14. Appellants like this appellant should know that the RTI Act is a means to advance public interest; not to be used as a tool to harass the public authority by a workless or disgruntled employee- serving/retired. His multiple RTI applications have a serious impact on the functioning of public authority BSNL/DOT, its RTI authorities and the Central Information Commission in Second Appeal. Officers also presented a bundle of files of the appellant. It reflects criminal wastage of time and, if unchecked, will chock the functioning of the public authority. If this is allowed, the public authority cannot focus on their regular duties and their whole time will be devoted to such frivolous/vexatious/useless/repeated/multiple/obnoxious RTI questions. This is misuse and it has to be prevented.

15. In relation to the multiple/indiscriminate filing of RTI application, Hon'ble Delhi High Court in **Shail Saini Vs. Sanjeev Kumar [W.P (c) No. 845/2014]** had observed as follows:

> 5. In the opinion of this Court, the primary duty of the officials of Ministry of Defence is to protect the sovereignty and integrity of India. If the limited manpower and resources of the Directorate General, Defence Estates as well as the Cantonment Board are devoted to address such meaningless queries, this Court is of the opinion that the entire office of the Directorate General, Defence Estates Cantonment Board would come to stand still. The Supreme Court in ***CBSE vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay***, (2011) 8 SCC 497, has held as under:-
>
> > 62. *When trying to ensure that the right to information does not conflict with several other public interests (which includes efficient operations of the Governments, preservation of confidentiality of sensitive information, optimum use of limited fiscal resources, etc.), it is difficult to visualise and*

enumerate all types of information which require to be exempted from disclosure in public interest. The legislature has however made an attempt to do so. The enumeration of exemptions is more exhaustive than the enumeration of exemptions attempted in the earlier Act, that is, Section 8 of the Freedom to Information Act, 2002. The courts and Information Commissions enforcing the provisions of the RTI Act have to adopt a purposive construction, involving a reasonable and balanced approach which harmonizes the two objects of the Act, while interpreting Section 8 and the other provisions of the Act.

....

67. *Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under the RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counterproductive as it will adversely affect the efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information. The Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens. Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties. The threat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of a public authorities prioritizing "information furnishing", at the cost of their normal and regular duties.*

6. After all disproportionate diversion of limited resources to Directorate General, Defence Estates' office would also take its toll on the Ministry of Defence. The Supreme Court in ***ICAI vs. Shaunak H. Satya***, (2011) 8 SCC 781 has held as under:-

39. We however agree that it is necessary to make a distinction in regard to information intended to bring transparency, to improve accountability and to reduce corruption, falling under Sections 4(1)(b) and (c) and other information which may not have a bearing on accountability or reducing corruption. The competent authorities under the RTI Act will have to maintain a proper balance so that while achieving transparency, the demand for information does not reach unmanageable proportions affecting other public interests, which include efficient operation of public authorities and the Government, preservation of confidentiality of sensitive information and optimum use of limited fiscal resources.

Consequently, this Court deems it appropriate to refuse to exercise its writ jurisdiction. Accordingly, present petition is dismissed. ***This Court is also of the view that misuse of the RTI Act has to be appropriately dealt with otherwise the public would lose faith and confidence in this "sunshine Act". A beneficent Statute, when made a tool for mischief and abuse must be checked in accordance with law.*** *A copy of this order is directed to be sent by the Registry to Defence and Law Ministry, so that they may examine the aspect of misuse of this Act, which confers very important and valuable rights upon a citizen.*

16. Filing of multiple RTI on the same subject creates fear among the public authority. The feel tormented by such disgruntled/ retired employees consuming through RTI their precious resource apart from causing mental agony. As observed by the Hon'ble High Court, "a beneficent Statute, when made a tool for mischief and abuse must be checked in accordance with law."

17. This Commission has earlier ordered that once an RTI application was finally decided it cannot be filed again (CIC/LS/C/2012/000860SA, http://indiankanoon.org/doc/140925637/). Responding to such **repeated** applications and continuing the same in first and second appeals will block the activity of public

authority, FAA and Information Commission and deprive the other genuine first-applicants waiting for information or adjudication. **Reckless repetition** of this kind without any feel about responsibility is nothing but abusing of RTI. From the reading of his multiple applications the Commission comes to an inevitable inference that this **retired appellant is misusing the free-time** available for him **to harass his colleagues** through the RTI, abusing the information and knowledge which he gained during his service in the Department in a most unreasonable manner. His own colleagues and subordinates are the victims of this harassment. From DoT, 24 officers including the senior officers like Chief Engineer, etc have attended the hearing. They are expected to devote their valuable time for office work and grievances of the consumers, but they are busy with answering the appellant's RTI applications which are without any aim or purpose, repeating the same answers. It is obvious that the appellant has **no public interest**. In fact, the appellant has caused huge loss.

Second Issue:

18. Whether serving/retired employees are having any right to behave in such a **manner to torture his colleagues and employer**? The Commission opines that such a conduct deserves to be considered as **mis-conduct.** There should be a system within the Public Authority to tackle such misconduct of any serving employee/retired employee or by any other staff member/out-sourced or similar nature, because they are becoming potential hazards of RTI misuse. Public authority should have **evolved a mechanism** and **service rules or include in conduct rules**, to initiate departmental action against existing/retired employees for such misbehavior or misconduct and impose penalty in the nature of cutting increments or pension emoluments for serving or retiring employees accordingly. If the RTI application from its own employee reflects a grievance or compliant, the public authority **should address grievance** immediately and inform him within one month. If the RTI application is

repeated, frivolous or useless one and only meant for harassing other employees or public authority as a whole, then the disciplinary action should be initiated for such alleged misconduct, leading to appropriate action. If they do not act at all against such characters (retired or not retired employees) in indulging in such misconduct of filing frivolous and entertain these repeated RTI applications it will cause huge wasting of public money. The public authority is answerable to public **why they are facilitating the misconduct** causing damage to public exchequer. Each department has to address the issue of misusing RTI by employee, after thoroughly examining each individual case separately.

Third Issue

19. Targeting the witnesses, complainants, superior officers who were members of inquiry committee or DPC who did not favour them and seeking whole lot of information about them under RTI Act is **irresponsible misuse of the right**. It will not only interfere with the independent inter-departmental decision making process, but also instill fear in inquiry officers and dissuade others from lodging complaints against wrongdoers. This increases the already existing space for wrongdoing ultimately affecting the governance. The RTI is not meant for granting such immunity or impunity to wrongdoing employees to misuse RTI to demoralize the complainants and inquiry officers. Some of the Mr Bansal's RTI applications are aimed at the officers who might have not favoured him in DPC. This is a dangerous trend. The repeated RTI applications and appeals by H K Bansal present bad example of misuse by retired employees targeting their past colleagues. In larger public interest of protecting the morale of officers, to facilitate independent decision making, to regulate and act against wrongdoers or non-performers or cantankerous litigants or those who bide away time in public office doing nothing or corrupting the processes, this kind of misuse of RTI against the public authority shall be curbed. Denial of information to the

applicants like this appellant is justified broadly under the exceptions prescribed in Section 8 (1) (g), (h), (j) and Section 8(2): See text of these sections:

Section 8. Exemption from disclosure of information: (1) Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act, there shall be no obligation to give any citizen,

> *(g) information, the disclosure of which would endanger the life or physical safety of any person or identify the source of information or* ***assistance given in confidence for law enforcement*** *or security purposes;*

20. Appellant is demanding the information about some employees/officers who gave assistance in confidence for law enforcement, which can be denied under this provision.

> *(h) information which would* ***impede the process of investigation or apprehension or prosecution of offenders****;*

21. Appellant's targeted demand for details of officers who decided or opined or complained or deposed against him will impede the process of collecting evidence of misconduct of accused public servant, impede process of inquiry for taking disciplinary action, hence need not be given under this clause.

> *(j) information which relates to personal information the disclosure of which has not relationship to any public activity or interest, or which would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the individual unless the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer or the appellate authority, as the case may be, is satisfied that the larger public interest justifies the disclosure of such information,*

22. Appellant's approach for the information pertaining to individual service of the colleagues, seniors and subordinates is motivated by his selfish personal interest of avenging based on his prejudice, and nowhere it reflects any public interest, thus it has to be denied.

Section 8(2) Notwithstanding anything in the Official Secrets Act, 1923 (19 of 1923) nor any of the exemptions permissible in accordance with subsection (1), a public authority may allow access to information, if public interest in disclosure outweighs the harm to the protected interests.

23. Even if the information sought appears to be in public domain because the colleagues are also employees, yet the consequences of disclosure need to be compared and only if there is public interest in disclosure it can be given. In these second appeals, the appellants' demand does not reflect any public interest. More over there is public interest in non-disclosure as explained above. The information sought cannot be given.

24. Exercising its powers under section 19(8)(v) of the RTI Act, the Commission requires that the higher authorities of DOT, BSNL/MTNL shall consider this serious issue and develop a mechanism to **curb this kind of mis-conduct/misuse**, as suggested above and save the RTI for the use of the people in general public interest.

25. The Commission further **directs** all the CPIOs of the respondent authority to prepare a comprehensive note on the number of RTI applications filed by the appellant, with his background, the responses given by them in the first appeal and second appeals, etc, and put it on the official website under the heading "Do not misuse RTI". The official website also should publish this order. If applicant files another repeated RTI application, public authority can give a single line reply to refer to these two files on the website and reject the application. This answers the first issue.

26. **Second issue** is also a significant one. The respondent officers made fervent appeal to the Commission that they were compelled to spend most of the time in

answering harassingly repeated questions about the same subject matter repeatedly asked from different angles; and about individual officers, whom, the applicant assumed to be responsible for the grievance.

27. The Commission noticed that some former employees in every public authority, who were either suspended or removed or facing charges, convicted in a crime or facing disciplinary action, or trying to run a counter inquiry with several harassing questions. The Commission also noted an atmosphere of fear and worry was spread in the offices and among the officers who are hesitating to take action against erring staff members for fear of facing flood of questions under RTI. Sometimes, the RTI applications are running into hundreds similar to those posed by lawyers during cross examination. The respondents submitted that they were ready to comply with the RTI Act but answering 'enquiry' type questions and repeated RTI applications would involve diversion of resources, energy besides having demoralizing effect. The Commission appreciates the genuineness of the problem and sincere feelings of the respondent officers and finds a need to address this serious issue. It is the responsibility of Government of India and Information Commissions to see that the RTI Act will not become rendezvous for disgruntled elements.

28. The Commission in the case of **Mukesh Sharma v. Delhi Transport Corporation [CIC/SA/A/2014/000615],** had observed as follows :

> *"Every employee has rights to secure his employment but also has duties to perform the job without resorting to misconduct or any other irregularity. The employee also has right to get the copy of complaint, notice, charge sheet and every piece of paper which is relied on against him. He should get the opportunity also to defend himself. At the end he should also get the copy of enquiry report/order/judgment or sentence pronounced along with right of appeal. He has all rights as per principles of natural justice and if there is any lapse, or suppression of information or document or non-supply of papers relied on by the disciplinary authority, he can seek them from the inquiry officer or authority, if not, he can get them under RTI Act, Though an*

employee facing disciplinary charges as explained above the accused employee does not have any moral or legal right to file plethora of RTI applications seeking information not related to allegation against him, but to harass the officers who he suspect to have complained or gave evidence or provided information or taken action against him, if done so it becomes misuse and that cannot be encouraged. The public interest is an overriding factor in these cases also as per the provisions of Right to Information Act, 2005. If such multiple RTI actions are allowed the officers at higher level will lose moral authority to initiate action against erring employees and whole system system of disciplined administration would crumble. In contra, there is a huge public interest in taking action against the wrongdoing employees.

Here in this case, the appellant is not even trying to protect his personal right, or right to employment or right to fair trial. But he is unleashing his private vengeance against colleagues or seniors who are either inquiring or informing or complaining or giving evidence against him. Such information would squarely fall under exempted category as per Section 8(h) ('information which would impede process of investigation or prosecution of offenders') of RTI Act, 2005 as this would not only impede the investigation or inquiry against him, but also impede the inquiries against all such erring employees who will be immorally encouraged or tempted to use RTI for this private, illegal and vengeful purpose. ***The RTI is not a rendezvous for suspended employees or those erring personnel facing inquiries to serve their personal interests in protecting their misconduct or preventing the authorities from proceeding with penal proceedings enquiring into misconduct****. The RTI is not for these disgruntled employees facing disciplinary proceedings or selfish persons but for the people in general, only in public interest, and never for the private vengeance at all.*

If this kind of misuse is not checked, and officers will be threatened, demoralized and prevented from proceeding against employees facing charges misconduct. None would complain/inform/give evidence or no authority would gather courage to initiate enquiry against erring employees even if law authorizes them, prescribes it as a duty and situation demands. Such a situation will lead to chaos in administration. In order

to check the misuse of RTI for running a parallel or counter enquiry against inquiring officers, this application deserves to be rejected and the appellant, admonished. "

29. Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in the case of **K K Sharma Vs. State of Haryana [W.P (C) No. 4930 of 2011]**in relation to disgruntled employees had observed as follows :

"Clearly, the provisions of the RTI Act would not be available to a disgruntled employee seeking information as regards public officials which is otherwise personal in nature on account of furtherance of a personal vendetta."

30. Thus any information sought about colleagues, inquiry officers, witnesses or complainant, DPC members, selection committee members or any other officer, by present/retired employee with private motive like vengeance against complainant or inquiry officer etc who are connected with disciplinary inquiry or action taken by virtue of their seniority or authority, should be thoroughly examined, giving him opportunity to present his case, and if proved, shall be denied under relevant exceptions of section 8(1) d, e, g, h, and j. The second appeals/complaints are found as frivolous, vexatious, lack in even the character of grievance and also devoid of any public interest. The CPIOs have sufficiently and substantially furnished the information to their best of their ability from the available records. There is nothing left to be given to this appellant. He does not deserve any more information, sympathy or consideration. Though he was abuser of RTI, the officers gave all possible information. All his second appeals are hereby rejected as entire information was given and also because of being abusive.

31. The Commission directs CPIO **need not answer** any RTI question or request, if filed by this appellant again in coming days, for information pertaining to officers mentioned in his various applications and appeals, or if part of new RTI request was already covered by his earlier RTI request for the reasons discussed above and also on the principle of *res judicata*, in order to prevent such appellants from hijacking time of public authorities that is to be used in service of public in general.

32. The Commission records its admonition against appellant for his frivolous and vexatious applications and hopes that he will not resort to mis-use of RTI any more, to protect the dignity of the positions he has held in the Public Authority while in service, and to show some element of gratitude to the organization that gave him livelihood.

33. With the above observations/directions the Commission disposes of all the appeals.

(M. Sridhar Acharyulu)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(Babu Lal)
Deputy Registrar

Address of the parties:

1. The CPIO under the RTI Act, Govt of India,
   Ministry of Telecommunications, Sanchar Bhavan,
   Ashoka Road, New Delhi-110001 (RTI Cell)

2. Shri H.K.Bansal
   Kanta Niwas 1011/24, Jagdish Colony
   Rohtak-124001, Haryana