

**THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE VIGILANCE—CUM- APPELLATE
AUTHORITY (VIGILANCE) UNDER RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT,
2005.**

ORDER

This is an order on the appeal dated 28.12.2018 (Diary No.R/SP(V)/7 dated 1.1.2018) preferred by Sh. Rajinder Kumar S/o Sh. Mehar Chand, Ward No.2, Old Sharma Street, Supreme Enclave, Near Vishavkarma Bhawan, Mansa-151505 under RTI Act 2005, received in this office against the disposal of his RTI application dated 29.11.2017 by the CPIO Vigilance, Chandigarh.

The appellant, vide his application dated 29.11.2017, under RTI Act 2005 had requested the CPIO-cum-OSD/Vigilance, Sector 9, Chandigarh to supply him some information pertaining to vigilance cell under RTI Act regarding vigilance trap against the public servant who is alleged for demanding bribe for a public work under PC Act, 1988 for the period 1988 to till date and also to provide certified copies of all the guidelines issued by Govt./Vigilance bureau for lying vigilance trap etc.

3. The required information was supplied by OSD/Vigilance, vide no.D-429/OSD/Vigilance dated 15.12.2017.

4. The appellant being not satisfied with the manner in which his application was disposed off by the CPIO, filed the instant appeal on the ground, "PIO had indirectly refused from providing information by giving vague reasons and directed me to visit various websites. I had already visited these websites where I did not find any specific guidelines. I need due to which I have to ask through RTI application. I do not need information regarding any specific case/FIR but in general". The applicant requested to supply the information sought by him as stated above.

Consequent upon on the above referred appeal, the comments of OSD-cum-CPIO/Vigilance have been obtained and the same are reproduced as under:-

The CPIO/Vigilance commented that the applicant was informed in written that "you are requested to intimate the FIR No. and years so that precise information can be supplied. It is informed that as per provision of Section 7(9) of RTI Act sought unless it would disproportionately divert the resources of the

public authority or would be detrimental to the safety or preservation of the record in question. However, the guidelines/instructions sought by the applicant are available on the public Domain, which can be accessed from the website www.cvc.nic.in.”

The RTI application of the applicant is disposed off within time limit and there is no malafide intention for not supplying the information as the information sought by the applicant is of long period i.e. 1998 to till date. The applicant has not sought specific information and has asked for supply of the information for example:-

1. From the year 1998 to 2017 kindly provide information about the cases where complainant was found wrong after the execution of trap and also provide the information about the action taken against the complainant.
2. After execution of trap complainant is taken under vigilance protection for helping him in his concerned work against which he had complained that public servant is demanding bribe and helped vigilance department in lying of trap, if that work is found artificially created/wrong/illegal by using fraudulently created documents then kindly provide the guidelines to deal with such complainant.
3. Information about illegal/unethical vigilance trap.

Keeping in view, the above mentioned vague information, the applicant was rightly informed to inform the FIR, date and name of the complainant etc. so that precise information can be supplied to the applicant. The sought information is scattered information, which has to be compiled after going through number of registers maintained in PS-Vigilance from 1998 to till date and would have diverted the man power to PS-Vigilance, so keeping in view the provisions of section 7(9) of RTI, vide which it has been mentioned that if supply of information diverts the resources, such information may not be supplied. Hence, the applicant was not supplied the information.

However, he was requested to supply the specifics of information needed so that precise information can be supplied. This office is still ready to supply the information, if applicant asks in specific terms about the information needed (viz. FIR No. date, complainant etc.)”

After receipt of the comments from OSD-cum-CPIO/Vigilance, the undersigned summoned you to come to office for personal hearing on 12.1.2018 at 12.00 Noon but despite noting down and receiving the summon and repeatedly called by my office from official telephone, you did not turn up and denied to come up for personal