

के िय सूचना आयोग
Central Information Commission
बाबा गंगनाथ मार्ग, मुनिरका
Baba Gangnath Marg, Munirka
नई द ली, New Delhi – 110067

ितीय अपील सं या / Second Appeal No. CIC/RBIND/A/2024/602288

Yogi M.P. Singh

... अपीलकर्ता/Appellant

VERSUS

बनाम

CPIO: Reserve Bank of India,
Mumbai

... तिवादीगण/Respondent

Relevant dates emerging from the appeal:

RTI : 01.09.2023	FA : 08.12.2023	SA : 15.01.2024
CPIO : 27.09.2023	FAO : 29.12.2023	Hearing : 03.04.2025

Date of Decision: 09.04.2025

CORAM:

Hon'ble Commissioner
ANANDI RAMALINGAM

ORDER

1. The Appellant filed an RTI application dated 01.09.2023 seeking information on the following points:

1. *“The information seeker registered the grievance PMOPG/E/2023/0174605 Grievance Concerns to Name Of Complainant Yogi M. P. Singh Date of Receipt 31/08/2023 the public grievance portal of the Government of India. The aforementioned grievance forwarded to the officer Ms Betsy Rajagopal (General Manager) of the Reserve Bank of India. CPIO may provide the information concerning the action taken by the officer mentioned above.*
2. *CPIO may provide the information regarding the noting made on the grievance and the endorsement by the competent authority.*

-
3. *CPIO may provide the information concerning the minutes of the proceedings to redress the grievance of the information seeker.*
 4. *CPIO may provide the name and designation of the staff of the Reserve Bank of India who are processing the grievance and also tell the information seeker whether the grievance was forwarded to the private bank Federal Bank in which bogus account in the name of Keshav Pratap Singh was opened by the fraudulent elements. Please provide the information in detail.*
 5. *Please provide the status of the bank account opened by the cheaters in the name of the Keshav Pratap Singh and the money transferred to this bogus account is safe or not....” etc.*
2. The CPIO replied vide letter dated 27.09.2023 and the same is reproduced as under :-
1. *“The CPGRAMS grievance PMOPG/E/2023/0174605 mentioned by the applicant in the query was received by Reserve Bank of India (RBI) from Department of Financial Services (DFS) on August 31, 2023. The grievance was returned by RBI to DFS on September 04, 2023 with the below comments
“The grievance does not fall under the ambit of RBI. hence returned for appropriate action by GOI. It may be taken up with the POSTAL AUTHORITY.”
The Action Taken Report of the aforesaid CPGRAMS complaint is attached herewith.
Applicant may approach the concerned public authority for action in the matter.*
 2. *The applicant may refer to the reply to query 1.*
 3. *The applicant may refer to the reply to query 1.*
 4. *The applicant may refer to the reply to query 1.*
 5. *We have no information in this regard.
However, the applicant may refer to the reply to query 1.”*
3. Dissatisfied with the response received from the CPIO, the Appellant filed a First Appeal dated 08.12.2023. The FAA vide order dated 29.12.2023 upheld the reply given

by the CPIO and observed that the RTI Act does not provide for redressal of grievances or seek remedy against administrative action etc.

4. Aggrieved with the FAA's order, the Appellant approached the Commission with the instant Second Appeal dated 15.01.2024.

5. The Appellant remained absent during the hearing and on behalf of the Respondent, Dipika Kadrekar, Manager & Rep. of CPIO along with Ayan Sharma, Legal Officer attended the hearing through video conference.

6. The Respondent reiterated the reply provided to the Appellant.

7. The Commission after adverting to the facts and circumstances of the case, and perusal of records, observes that concededly through the First & Second Appeal, the Appellant is not agitating upon his right to information but seeks to challenge the merits of the action taken on his averred CPGRAMS petition. In a strict sense, the First Appeal filed on such grounds was not even maintainable under the RTI Act, yet the FAA has decided the First Appeal on merits in keeping with the spirit of the RTI Act.

8. Having observed as above, the Appellant is advised about the powers of the Commission under the RTI Act by relying on certain precedents of the superior Courts as under:

The Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the matter of *Hansi Rawat and Anr. v. Punjab National Bank and Ors. (LPA No.785/2012) dated 11.01.2013* has held as under:

"6. ...proceedings under the RTI Act cannot be converted into proceedings for adjudication of disputes as to the correctness of the information furnished."(Emphasis Supplied)

The aforesaid rationale finds resonance in another judgment of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in the matter of *Govt. of NCT of Delhi vs. Rajender Prasad (W.P.[C] 10676/2016) dated 30.11.2017* wherein it was held as under:

“6. The CIC has been constituted under Section 12 of the Act and the powers of CIC are delineated under the Act. The CIC being a statutory body has to act strictly within the confines of the Act and is neither required to nor has the jurisdiction to examine any other controversy or disputes.”

While, the Apex Court in the matter of **Union of India vs Namit Sharma (Review Petition [C] No.2309 of 2012) dated 03.09.2013** observed as under:

“20. ...While deciding whether a citizen should or should not get a particular information “which is held by or under the control of any public authority”, the Information Commission does not decide a dispute between two or more parties concerning their legal rights other than their right to get information in possession of a public authority....” **(Emphasis Supplied)**

9. The Appeal is dismissed accordingly.

Copy of the decision be provided free of cost to the parties.

Sd/-

(Anandi Ramalingam) (आनंदी राम लंगम)
Information Commissioner (सूचना आयु)
दनांक/Date: 09.04.2025

Authenticated true copy

Sharad Kumar (शरद कुमार)
Dy. Registrar (उप पंजीयक)
011-26180514

Addresses of the parties:

1 The CPIO
Reserve Bank of India,
CPIO, Consumer Education
And Protection Department,
Central Office, 1st Floor, Amar
Bldg., Sir P. M. Road, Fort,
Mumbai-400001

2 Yogi M. P. Singh