

അപേക്ഷകൻ ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ട വിവരങ്ങൾ ഏതെങ്കിലും ഓഫീസിൽ ഉണ്ടാകാം എന്ന നിഗമനത്തിൽ അങ്ങനെയുള്ള എല്ലാ ഓഫീസിലേക്കും അപേക്ഷയുടെ പകർപ്പുകൾ കൈമാറാനുള്ള ബാധ്യത പബ്ലിക് ഇൻഫർമേഷൻ ഓഫീസർക്കില്ല

The appellant had made two requests for information under the RTI Act, 2005 before the first respondent, on 15.1.2007. The information requested were the details of wills registered by his father and mother. The first respondent gave a combined reply to the two requests on 8.2.07, stating that there was no secret will deposited in the office of the District Registrar (General). It was also informed that wills were registered in the Sub-Registrar Offices. Aggrieved by the decision of the first respondent in not divulging the details of wills registered in Sub-Registrar offices, the appellant filed the first appeal before the second respondent on 27.2.07. The first appeal was dismissed by the second respondent vide letter dated 3.3.07.

2. A copy of the appeal petition together with accompaniments was forwarded to the second respondent for a detailed report in the matter. The second respondent has submitted a detailed report dated 9.5.07. It is reported that secret wills are deposited in the offices of the District Registrar (General) while other wills can be registered in any Sub-Registrar office. In the absence of information on the Sub-Registrar Office in which a will was/might have been registered, it was not possible to transfer the request to the concerned Sub-Registrar under section 6 (3) of the RTI Act.

3. The Commission had a detailed and meticulous examination of the appeal petition, the report of the second respondent and all other documents produced before the Commission. The Commission found that the information available in the office of the first respondent was given to the appellant. In the absence of knowledge about the office in which the wills might have been registered, the first respondent was not under an obligation to transfer the request to all the Sub Registrars under him. If the details of the Sub-Registrar with whom the wills were/might have been registered was known to the first respondent, the first respondent was bound to transfer the request to the concerned Sub-Registrar. The first respondent is not expected to contact all the Sub-Registrars under him and find out whether any will was registered with them. The Commission find that the action of the first respondent in informing the appellant that wills were registered in Sub-Registrar Offices was the right decision under the RTI Act, 2005. The Commission decide that no further action is warranted on the appeal petition.

The Appeal is dismissed.

Dated this the 30th day of May 2007.

Sd/-

Palat Mohandas

Chief Information Commissioner

Sd/-

V.V.Giry

Information Commissioner