



**Shri Rakesh Kumar Gupta** Advocate, M: 9814924851  
8/237, Jagraon Road, .....Appellant/Complainant  
Mandi Mullanpur,  
District Ludhiana.-141101  
Versus  
**Public Information Officer** .....Respondent  
O/o SSP, Jagraon, Ludhiana

**Public Information Officer**  
O/o DGP, PB, Chandigarh

**First Appellate Authority**  
O/o DGP, PB, Chandigarh.

**Appeal Case No. 1127 of 2020**  
**Date of Institution: 16.03.2020**  
**Date of Decision: 23.12.2020**

**ORDER (Pronounced)**

1. The above mentioned appeal case was heard by the bench of undersigned on 16.12.2020 and decision was kept reserved, which is being pronounced today.

**Sought Information:**

Information pertaining to Inquiry report No. 1768 AIG/CI Ludhiana Dt. 15.02.2016 sent by AIG/CI Ludhiana.

**Observations & Decision :**

2. Similar RTI application was filed by appellant to the intelligence wing which was denied under section 24(4) of RTI Act 2005 vide letter no. 207/RTI cell/Int dated 10.12.2019. Appellant directly challenged the decision of PIO/Intelligence dated 16.03.2020 in PSIC by filling an appeal case no. 1128/2020, without approaching to FAA. The Commission disposed of the case no. 1128/2020 with the directions to his first appeal. In compliance of the directions passed by the Commission dated 01.09.2020 his first appeal was considered and rejected by FAA, Intelligence vide letter No. 826/RTI-cum-Litigation Cell, dated 15.10.2020.
3. The primary contention of the Appellant is that the sought information does not pertain to any policy matter/secretcy and its revelation will pose any type of threat to Nation, state, person and will not affect the security of any person therefore, the exception under section 24(4) is not attracted.

**However, the type of information the appellant has solicited, reduced to the norms of the RTI Act therefore, Commission finds no merit in such contention raised by the appellant. On the other hand, we do find that there is substance in the contention of the Respondent. The Commission concurs with the detailed order passed by the FAA of the Respondent and we also confirm our earlier order (supra) passed on this same issue where it was categorically held by the bench of undersigned vide which it was transferred to FAA and the case was closed.**

**Appeal Case No. 1127 of 2020**

**Date of Institution: 16.03.2020**

**Date of Decision: 23.12.2020**

4. The disclosure of such information is **not in the public interest** as the appellant has asked for the information for promotion of his personal interest stating "that concerned person is my friend". Therefore, the PIO is justified in denying the information sought, **u/s 24(4)** of the Act.

*U/s 24(4) of RTI Act 2005 exempts intelligence and security organisations from the purview of the Act and hence, puts a bar on the amount of transparency in the government and several public authorities and by extension, a bar on democracy itself.*

**Accordingly, the case is disposed of and closed at Commission's end.**

5. Copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh  
Dated: 23.12.2020**

**(Dr.Pawan Kumar Singla)  
State Information Commissioner**