DIRECTORATE OF EDUCATION (ACT BRANCH)
OLD SECRETARIAT, DELHI – 110054.

No. DE/15/ACT/RTI/ID-7602/2011/ 22278 Dated : 12/9/14

To
O /s IT Branch
Dte. of Education,
Delhi-110054

Sub. : Compliance order of the Hon'ble CIC in r/o RTI application filed by Sh. Manish Aggarwal vide ID No. 7602 (Act-1 Branch)
Ref. File No. CIC/AD/A/2013/001930-SA dated 28.7.14

Sir,

In compliance to the above said order no. dated 28.7.14 (Copy enclosed). In which Hon'ble CIC has directed the Public Authority to give a comprehensive but brief report.

The applicant has filed approximately 23 RTI applications regarding same school i.e. DAV Shreshta Vihar, Delhi-92.

You are therefore requested to upload the attached documents of the Departmental website under the heading Public Circulars.

Encl : as above

(P. Lata Tara)
ASSTT. DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION (ACT)/PIO

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

(1)File No.CIC/AD/A/2013/001929-SA
(2)File No.CIC/AD/A/2013/001930-SA

(Mr. Manish Aggarwal Vs. Dte of Education GNCTD)

Appellant	:	**Mr. Manish Aggarwal**
Respondent	:	**Directorate of Education GNCTD, Delhi**
Date of hearing	:	**15-07-2014**
Date of decision	:	**28-07-2014**
Information Commissioner	:	**Prof. M. Sridhar Acharyulu (Madabhushi Sridhar)**
Referred Sections	:	**Sections 3, 19(3) of the RTI Act**
Result	:	**Appeal allowed / disposed of**

The appellant is not present. The Public Authority is represented by Mr. Manoj Kumar, OS(RTI Hqrs), Mr. R.P.Tripathi, Supdt Vigilance (Hqs), Mr. Vinay Kumar, Ms. Neha Shankar, Supdt. O/o DDE(East) and Mr. V.K.Gaur, DEO(Act-I), Directorate of Education, GNCTD, Delhi.

2. The appellant has filed the above two appeals against the same Public Authority and hence they are heard together today.

FACTS

2. Through his RTI applications dated 17-1-2013, the appellant has sought action taken report on the complaint filed by him against Smt. Saroj Bala Sain, DDE(East) and other related details and in the second RTI application dated 26-12-2012, he had sought a copy of the inspection report for the last three years in respect of DAV Public School, Shresta Vihar, Delhi. The PIO has sent information in both the cases by his letters dated 12-2-2013 and 7-2-2013, on which the appellant made first appeal in both the cases, before the FAA, who by his orders dated 8-4-2013 and 21-3-2013 upheld the information given by the PIO and disposed of the first appeals. Claiming non-satisfaction over the information furnished by the respondent authority, the appellant filed 2nd appeal before the Commission in both the cases.

Decision:

3. Heard the submissions made by the respondent authority in the above two appeals. The appellant is not present. The respondent authority submitted that the appellant Mr. Manish Aggarwal has filed at least 20 RTI applications on the same subject, mostly relating to the same school from different angles. Complete information was given to the present RTI application which was also recorded by the First Appellate Authority on 8-4-2013. After having received the all the information, the appellant filed 2nd appeal, in which he had stated that he wanted information for each and every point, specifically and para-wise with due application of mind. The appellant filed complaint against the illegal encroachment of the DAV Public School, which is now the matter pending before the Delhi High Court. The Commission observes that it is a case of repeated misuse of RTI Act by the appellant

resulting in harassment of Public Authority. PIO(Act-I) of the respondent authority submitted that the appellant is filing several RTI applications both at the Education Headquarters at Delhi Secretariat and at the different Education Districts of Delhi, seeking the same information.

4. The PIOs representing the Public Authority, are directed to verify whether the RTI applications filed by the appellant earlier were on the same subject matter and whether the same were answered already by the PIOs. If it is so, then the PIO can straightaway reject the repetition of the RTI application on the same subject, unless the applicant has sought any new information. The RTI questions/requests for information pertaining to the same institution from different angles will definitely have a harassing effect on the educational institution and on the PIO and hence the PIO is expected to ascertain whether any larger public interest is involved in answering the questions. If there is no public interest and the questions are harassing in nature, the same can be rejected. The Commission also advises the appellant not to resort to repetition of RTI questions which does not reflect a balanced state of mind and also causes enormous wastage of public time supposed to be used for public interest by the Public Authorities. The Commission also directs the Public Authority to give a comprehensive but brief report of the present appellant's RTI questions, the responses to the same given by the PIO/FAA/CIC, put up this report in the official web-site of the Public Authority and exhibit the same, at a conspicuous place in the office premises of the respondent authority.

5. With the above observations, the Commission comes to the conclusion that the appellant has been furnished with all the information by the respondent authority in both the appeals and hence the above two appeals are **dismissed.**

(M. Sridhar Acharyulu)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(Ashwani K. Sharma)
Designated Officer

Address of the parties:

1. The CPIO under RTI, Govt. Of NCT of Delhi,
Directorate of Education (Old Secretariat),
RTI Cell, Room No.220 DELHI-110092

2. The CPIO under RTI, Govt. of NCT of Delhi
Directorate of Education-Act-I Branch,
Old Secretariat, RTI Cell, DELHI-110092

3. Shri Manish Aggarwal,

A-102, First Floor, Yojna Vihar,

DELHI-110092