

**BEFORE THE REGISTRAR OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES-CUM-FIRST APPELLATE
AUTHORITY UNDER THE RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT, 2005**

Present: **Dr. A.S. SIVAKUMAR,**
Registrar of Co-operative Societies-cum-
First Appellate Authority.

FA/16/2015

Thiru N. Ramesh,
Door No. 12, Middle Street,
Kalitheerthalkuppam,
Madagadipet Post,
Puducherry – 605 107.

>>>>

Appellant

Vs.

The Public Information Officer,
Pondicherry Co-operative Spinning Mills Ltd.,
Puducherry – Villupuram National High Way,
Thiruvandarkil Post, Thirubuvanai,
Puducherry – 605 102.

>>>>

Respondent

ORDER

(Issued under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005)

Inveighing and impugning the denial of information to his application filed under Right to Information Act, 2005 (for short 'the Act'), the respondent invokes his statutory remedy provided under Section 19 of the Act and filed this first appeal.

2. In a set of 7 queries, vide application dated 29.5.2015, the appellant / applicant sought details on the cash on hand, welfare expenses, expenses on kitchen equipments, customer service charges, amount spent on office equipments and maintenance, and closing cash balance month-wise, of the Pondicherry Co-operative Spinning Mills for a specified period.



3. To all the queries, the respondent, vide letter dated 26.6.2015, gave an identical reply that questions and explanation will not fall within the definition of "information" and evidence cannot be supplied under the Act.

4. On taking the appeal on file, the respondent was directed to file his response. In his response, the respondent submitted that the appellant has requested for income and expenditure statement of the Mills for the period from 10.1.2012 to 30.3.2015 and based on the information provided to him, he was seeking the details, vide application dated 29.5.2015. The respondent maintained that under the Act, the Public Information Officer is bound to provide only information which are available with him and is not duty-bound to provide explanation, reasons, basis, etc.

5. To give quietus to this matter, both the parties were directed to appear before me on 21.8.2015. The appellant sought for an adjournment as he was preoccupied. The respondent authorised Thiru S. Muthukumarasamy, Superintendent – Grade II (Incharge) to represent him. The respondent submitted that an applicant can seek only information under the Act, but the appellant sought for evidence of the expenses and hence the respondent denied information stating that the queries of the appellant do not qualify as "information" under Section 2(f) of the Act.



