

Central Information Commission  
File No.CIC/SM/A/2009/000669 dated 06-08-2008  
Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (19)

Dated: 12 April 2010

Name of the Appellant : Shri Vinod Kumar Kashyap  
C/o Shri. Prahalad Singh,  
Chamber No. 275 - A,  
Distt & Session Court Roshnibad,  
Distt - Haridwar, Uttrakhand.

Name of the Public Authority : CPIO, Syndicate Bank,  
Regional Office, Bhawanipur,  
University Road, Meerut, UP.

The Appellant was present along with Shri Prahalad Singh.

On behalf of the Respondent, the following were present:-

- (i) Shri GPS Angroola, AGM,
- (ii) Shri Kavindra Solanki, Manager (Law)

2. In this case, the Appellant had, in his application dated 6 August 2008, requested the Branch Manager about a number of details regarding the dis-honouring of a number of cheques. In his reply dated 7 August 2008, the Branch Manager provided some information. Once again, the Appellant wrote to the Branch Manager/CPIO on 18 August 2008 seeking some more information in this regard. In an interim reply dated 3 October 2008, he was informed that the authorities were searching for the old records and would revert to him. Finally, the CPIO wrote to him on 15 November 2008 and provided more or less the same information which the Branch Manager had already provided on 7 August 2008 clearly stating that the request letter was not traceable in the Branch. Against this, the Appellant preferred an appeal which the Appellate Authority rejected in his order dated 27 January 2009 by endorsing the information already provided. It is against this order that the Appellant has come to the CIC in second appeal.

3. The Appellant was not present during the hearing in spite of notice. However, he reported much later after the Respondents had left. The Respondents were present and submitted that they could not locate the letter by which the Appellant had informed the Branch to stop payment against a certain cheque. We carefully examined the facts of the case. Even

if the original letter of the Appellant requesting for stopping payment against a certain cheque was not available, we find it difficult to understand why the CPIO took such a long time in informing this. The Respondents submitted that the CPIO had sent an interim communication and that he had made a lot of effort to locate the original document which resulted in some delay. They further submitted that the delay was not intentional and the desire was always there to provide the information. Keeping these submissions in mind, we do not intend to impose any penalty on the CPIO for we think the he had made efforts to locate the original document and had thus some reasonable cause for the delay.

4. The fact, however, remains that the Appellant was put to both harassment and some financial loss on account of not receiving the information in time. He has explained in detail in the second appeal about the adverse consequences he suffered on this account. Besides, he has also incurred expenditure in connection with the second appeal preferred before this Commission. We are of the view that the public authority, that is the Bank, should compensate the Appellant for this loss. Therefore, in exercise of the powers vested in the CIC under Section 19 (8)(b) of the Right to Information (RTI) Act, we direct the Syndicate Bank to compensate the Appellant by an amount of Rs. 3000 for the financial loss and harassment caused to the Appellant due to the delay in supply of information. The CPIO shall ensure that the above amount of compensation is sent to the Appellant within 30 working days from the receipt of this order by way of Demand Draft or Banker's Cheque.

5. The case is, thus, disposed off.

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

**(Satyananda Mishra)**  
**Information Commissioner**

Authenticated true copy. Additional copies of orders shall be supplied against application and payment of the charges prescribed under the Act to the CPIO of this Commission.

**(Vijay Bhalla)**  
**Assistant Registrar**