

ഒരു പബ്ലിക് ഇൻഫർമേഷൻ ഓഫീസർ ചെയ്തത് ശരിയായിരുന്നോ എന്ന് പരിശോധിച്ച് വിശദീകരണം നൽകാൻ മറ്റൊരു പബ്ലിക് ഇൻഫർമേഷൻ ഓഫീസർക്ക് ബാധ്യതയില്ല. ഇത് സംബന്ധിച്ച് എന്തെങ്കിലും സംശയമുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ ഒന്നാം അപ്പീൽ സമർപ്പിക്കുകയായിരുന്ന അപേക്ഷകൻ ചെയ്യേണ്ടായിരുന്നു

3. It appears the Appellant had sought some information under the RTI from some other department of the government. The CPIO of that department had declined to disclose the information on the ground that some guidelines issued by the DoPT did not permit disclosure of such information. Now, in his present RTI application addressed to the CPIO of the DoPT, the Appellant wants to know if the CPIO of the other department was right in declining the information. In response, the CPIO had pointed out to him that it was not his duty to interpret any action of another CPIO. The Appellate Authority had endorsed the decision of the CPIO.

4. We have carefully considered the facts of the case. The fact of the matter is that the Appellant had sought some information from another department which was denied to him by referring to some guidelines issued by the DoPT. Whether the CPIO concerned interpreted the guidelines correctly or not or whether he exceeded his brief and duty beyond what is laid down in the Right to Information (RTI) Act is an issue which can be adjudicated only by the CIC and not by another CPIO. The right course for the Appellant should have been to come before the CIC in second appeal against the denial of information by the other department and not go back to the CPIO of the DoPT seeking clarification on the rightness of the action of the other CPIO. Therefore, we find nothing wrong in the response of the CPIO/Appellate Authority in the DoPT in this case.

5. There is no merit in the appeal. It is disposed of accordingly.

6. Copies of this order be given free of cost to the parties.

(Satyananda Mishra
Chief Information Commissioner)