

**CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION**

2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, August Kranti Bhawan,  
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066

**Decision No. CIC/SB/A/2015/000639**

**Dated 12.01.2017**

**Appellant** : Shri Raj Kumar Jha,  
D-1/A (Behind D-1), Jangpura-B,  
New Delhi-110 014.

**Respondent** : Central Public Information Officer,  
Delhi Police, O/o the DCP,  
South East District, Sarita Vihar, Delhi.

**Date of Hearing** : 12.01.2017

**Relevant dates emerging from the appeal:**

RTI application filed on : 11.06.2015  
CPIO's reply : 14.07.2015  
First appeal filed on : 22.07.2015  
FAA's order : 20.08.2015  
Second Appeal filed on : 16.11.2015

**ORDER**

1. Shri Raj Kumar Jha filed an application dated 11.06.2015 under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) before the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO), South East District, Delhi Police seeking information on twenty-six points pertaining to the action taken on his complaint lodged through a call to the PCR on 25.12.2014 relating to atrocities against a woman by the Police personnel of P.S. Jaitpur.

2. The appellant filed a second appeal dated 16.11.2015 before the Commission on the grounds that the CPIO informed him that the requisite

---

information cannot be provided as his RTI application is more than five hundred words, and that the FAA advised the appellant to reduce the length of his RTI application. The appellant states that the CPIO deliberately and malafidely denied information by ignoring the proviso to Rule 3 of the Right to Information Rules, 2012. The appellant alleges that CPIO has deliberately not provided the information as the same would have revealed the misconduct of his colleagues and subordinates.

**Hearing:**

**3.** Both the appellant Shri Raj Kumar Jha and the respondent Shri Sanjeev Kumar, Sub-Inspector, RTI Cell, South East District, Delhi Police, were present in person.

**4.** The appellant submitted that information sought has been incorrectly denied to him on the ground that RTI application is more than 500 words and hence, in accordance with Rule 3 of the RTI Rules, 2012, information could not be provided to him. The appellant further submitted that the information was deliberately not provided to him and Rule 3 of the RTI Rules, 2012 was quoted in ignorance of the proviso to the Rule 3 which states that “..... *no application shall be rejected only on the ground that it contains more than five hundred words*”. The appellant requested the Commission to direct the respondent to provide complete and correct point wise information to him.

**5.** The respondent submitted that the appellant was informed vide letter dated 22.07.2015 that the requisite information cannot be provided as the RTI application was more than five hundred words and hence, in accordance with the Rule 3 of the RTI Rules 2012 the appellant was advised to cut down the number of queries so that the information sought could be provided to him.

**Decision:**

6. The Commission, after hearing the submissions of both the parties and perusing the records, agrees with the appellant that the RTI application cannot be rejected only on the grounds that it is lengthy as proviso to the Rule 3 of the RTI Rules, 2012 states that “..... *no application shall be rejected only on the ground that it contains more than five hundred words*”. In view of this, the Commission directs the respondent to provide correct, complete and point-wise information as per available records to the appellant, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

7. With the above observations, the appeal is disposed of.

8. Copy of the decision be provided free of cost to the parties.

**(Sudhir Bhargava)**  
**Information Commissioner**

**Authenticated true copy**

**(V.K. Sharma)**  
**Designated Officer**