मुख्य आयुक्त कार्यालय, केंद्रीय माल और सेवा कर, अहमदाबाद क्षेत्र ग्वीं मंजिल, जीएसटी भवन, राजस्व मार्ग, अम्बावाडी, अहमदाबाद – ३८००१५



Office of the Chief Commissioner, Central Goods & Service Tax, Ahmedabad Zone, 7th Floor, GST Bhavan, Revenue Marg, Ambawadi, Ahmedabad- 380015

Telephone: 079-26302133/6499 Email: ccu-cexamd@nic.in

Date: 22-08-2025

By Email

क.	मूल आदेश संख्या	21/RTI (CCO)/AHD/2025-26
A.	Order in Original	21/RTI (CCO)/AHD/2025-26
	No.	
ख.	पारितकर्ता अधिकारी	श्री शाजी मैथ्यू कुट्टीकंदथिल,
		सहायक आयुक्ते एवं केंद्रीय लोक सूचना अधिकारी,
		कार्यालय, प्रधान मुख्य आयुक्त केंद्रीय वस्तु
		एवं सेवाकर, अहमदाबाद क्षेत्र.
В.	Passed by	Shri Shaji Mathew Kuttikandathil,
		Assistant Commissioner & CPIO,
		Office of the Principal Chief Commissioner
		Central GST, Ahmedabad Zone.
ग.	आदेश जारी करने की	22-08-2025
	तारीख	
C.	Date of	22-08-2025
	order/Issue	
घ.	आवेदक का नाम और	श्री मनोज बालकृषण) पाटिल, बंगलो नं. 10, ईस्ट स्ट्रीट कैंप, लश्कर
	पता	पुलिस क्वार्टर के पास, पुणे- 411001
D.	Name and address	Shri Manoj Balkrishan Patil, Bungalow Number 10,East
	of Applicant	Street Camp, Next to Lashkar Police Quarters, Pune-411001

- 1. यह मूल आदेश सम्बंधित व्यक्ति को निशुल्क प्रदान किया जाता है | This Order-in-Original is granted to the concerned free of charge.
- 2. इस मूल आदेश द्वारा असंतुष्ट कोई भी व्यक्ति, सूचना का अधिकार अधिनियम, 2005 की धारा 19 (1) के अंतर्गत श्री सचिन गुसिया, अपर आयुक्त (प्र. मु. आ. का.), केंद्रीय वस्तु एवं सेवाकर, अहमदाबाद जोन, सातवीं मंजिल, केंद्रीयजी.एस.टी. भवन, पॉलिटेक्निक के पास, अंबावाड़ी, अहमदाबाद के समक्ष अपील दाखिल करे।

Any person aggrieved by this Order-in-Original may file an appeal under section 19 (1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 to Shri Sachin Gusia, Additional Commissioner (PCCO), Central GST, Ahmedabad Zone, 7th floor, Central GST Bhavan, Nr. Polytechnic, Ambawadi, Ahmedabad.

3. सूचना का अधिकार अधिनियम, 2005 की धारा 19 (1) के उपबंधों के अनुसार, इस आदेश की प्राप्ति की तारीख से 30 दिवस के अंदर अपीलीय प्राधिकारी के समक्ष अपील दाखिल की जानी है Appeal shall be filed within thirty days from the date of receipt of this order in accordance with the provisions of section 19 (1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005, before the Appellate Authority.

सूचना का अधिकार अधिनियम, 2005 के अंतर्गत आदेश/Order under the Right to Information Act, 2005

श्री मनोज बालकृष्ण पाटिल, बंगला नंबर 10, ईस्ट स्ट्रीट केंप, लश्कर पुलिस क्वार्टर के बगल में, पुणे-411001 (जिसे आगे आवेदक कहा जाएगा) ने आरटीआई दायर की है, जिसकी पंजीकरण संख्या CCEAB/R/T/25/00176, CCEAB/R/T/25/00177, CCEAB/R/T/25/00178, CCEAB/R/T/25/00183, CCEAB/R/T/25/00184, CCEAB/R/X/25/00013, CCEAB/R/X/25/00014, CCEAB/R/X/25/00015, CCEAB/R/X/25/00016 DGOPM/R/X/25/00018, DGOPM/R/X/25/00017, DGOPM/R/T/25/00048, CCEAB/R/T/25/00187, CCEAB/R/T/25/00188, CCEAB/R/T/25/00189 है।

आवेदक द्वारा इस कार्यालय के लिए मांगी गई वांछित जानकारी का उत्तर निम्नानुसार है: Reply for the desired information for this office as sought by the applicant is as below:

As per Section 2(f) of RTI Act, 2005, the definition of "information" is as under:-

(f) "information" means any material in any form, including records, documents, memos, e-mails, opinions, advices, press releases, circulars, orders, logbooks, contracts, reports, papers, samples, models, data material held in any electronic form and information relating to any private body which can be accessed by a public authority under any other law for the time being in force;

As per Section 2(j) of RTI Act, 2005, the definition of "right to information" is as under:-

- (j) "right to information" means the right to information accessible under this Act which is held by or under the control of any public authority and includes the right to
- (i) inspection of work, documents, records;
- (ii) taking notes, extracts or certified copies of documents or records;
- (iii) taking certified samples of material;
- (iv) obtaining information in the form of diskettes, floppies, tapes, video cassettes or in any other electronic mode or through printouts where such information is stored in

a computer or in any other device;

Accordingly, a citizen has a right to seek such information from a public authority which is held by the public authority or which is held under its control. This right includes inspection of work, documents and records; taking notes, extracts or certified copies of documents or records; taking certified samples of material held by the public authority or held under the control of the public authority. The public authority under the RTI Act is not supposed to create information; or to interpret information; or to solve the problems raised by the applicants; or to submit action taken report or compliances.

It has been observed that, previously, the applicant has filed lots of RTI applications. Further, the filing pattern appears to be excessive and perceived as a deliberate attempt to harass Public Information Officers (PIOs). Notably, his repeated applications, particularly those focused on matters concerning the Central Board of Indirect Tax and Customs (CBIC), lead to believe that his actions are more aligned with personal interests rather than a genuine pursuit of public information. The large number of RTI applications filed by the applicant, unfortunately, causing a substantial waste of public resources, both in terms of finances and man-hours. This is especially concerning as it diverts the resources both manpower, and physical and electronic infrastructure towards, what appears to be a non-genuine and wasteful application of RTI act for indiscriminate and sundry information with no-nexus with public interest. This makes the RTI applications liable for rejection decision is in line with precedents and ratio of decisions by the Central Information Commission (CIC) and judicial authorities, some of which are discussed below:

• In the case of Jagdish Kumar Koli vs. Department of School Education & Literacy, vide order No. CIC/SAIA/2015/001849 dated: 25.02.2016 held that

"the appellant has sufficiently used the RTI Act for his self-interest, without any public interest for his personal vengeance against the public authority............".

The Commission, therefore, rejects the appeal, with admonition; finally disposes of all his appeals on this matter, directs the appellant that he shall not repeat such RTI requests, and directs the respondent authority not to cause wastage of public resources in responding to a repeated, frivolous and harassing RTI application from the appellant. The Commission also directs the Public Authority to publish this order on their official website under the heading "Repeated, harassing RTI applications cannot be entertained."

Your applications similarly seem to lack a larger public interest, and ratio of the

decision is squarely applicable.

Additionally, in the case of Ramesh Chand Jain vs. Delhi Transport Corporation, the CIC vide its order no. CIC/AD/A120131001326-54 dated: 25.06.2014 emphasized that

"if the applicant seeks the information again and again the PIO, the First Appellate Authority and the Commission would be forced to spend their time on this repeated application, and in the process the authorities would loss that much time to address other RTI application or performing their general duties in their public office. The repeated RTI Applications will amount to clog the office of the public authority and CPIO would be justified in refusing the same with intimation of reasons."

• Further, the Delhi High Court judgment vide LPA No. 20712020 dated: 31.08.2020 in Dr. R. S Gupta Vs Gpct. NCTD & Ors. highlighted

"the disclosure of this information ex-facie has no relationship to any public activity or public interest and pertinently, the appellant is not able to explain or show any nexus between the personal information sought and the public interest involved, for seeking its disclosure. Thus, in our view, in absence of even a remote connection with any larger public interest, disclosure of information would be exempted as the same would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the individual under section 8(l) O of the RTI Act. Petitioner has thus failed to establish that the information sought for is for any public interest, much less 'larger public interest'. Therefore, we are not inclined to entertain this appeal. In terms of the cited decision also, this office has proposed to reject all your applications filed under RTI Act, 2005 as they did not contain any public interest or even a remote connection with any larger public interest."

The ratio of judgment is applicable in present case.

• Also, the Delhi High Court in its judgment in the case of Ram Gopal Yadav vs. Central Information Commission & Ors. (2016 SCC On Line Del5563) held that

"If the information sought is too voluminous and requires a disproportionate amount of diversion of resources, the public authority has the right to refuse the request for information. The court further stated that the RTI Act was not intended to be used as a tool for fishing of information or to target public authorities with excessive and unreasonable requests."

The ratio of judgment is applicable in this case of RTI applications too.

• Finally, the case of Central Board of Secondary Education & Ors. vs. Aditya

Bandopadhyay, as decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, emphasized that

"indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption; would be counter-productive as it will adversely affect the efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties. The threat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure. of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of a public authorities prioritizing 'information furnishing', at the cost of their normal and regular duties".

In light of the challenges posed by the continuous and voluminous nature of applicant's RTI applications, this office is contemplating the rejection of all RTI applications in future. This decision aligns with the guidance provided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, recognizing the potential for such requests to overwhelm the regular functioning of public authorities.

The cumulative effect of applicant's daily and repetitive submissions has resulted in a considerable diversion of resources, both in terms of manpower and public funds. The constant demand for information through multiple applications is perceived as non-productive, hindering ability of this office to focus on essential public duties.

As discussed in foregoing paras, in accordance with Section 7(9) of the RTI Act reproduced here:

"An information shall ordinarily be provided in the form in which it is 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."

In view of the above, the above mentioned RTI applications are rejected. उपरोक्त को ध्यान में रखते हुए, उपरोक्त आरटीआई आवेदन अस्वीकार किया जाता है।

Shaji Mathew Kuttikandathil ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER सहायक आयुक्त एवं केंद्रीय लोक सूचना अधिकारी Assistant Commissioner & CPIO

- I. Shri Manoj Balkrishan Patil, Bungalow Number 10,East Street Camp, Next to Lashkar Police Quarters, Pune411001, on provided Email Id: patilmanojpm12@gmail.com.
- II. F.No. CCEAB/R/T/25/00176, CCEAB/R/T/25/00177, CCEAB/R/T/25/00178, CCEAB/R/T/25/00183, CCEAB/R/T/25/00184, CCEAB/R/X/25/00013, CCEAB/R/X/25/00014, CCEAB/R/X/25/00015, CCEAB/R/X/25/00016 DGOPM/R/X/25/00018, DGOPM/R/X/25/00017, DGOPM/R/T/25/00048, CCEAB/R/T/25/00187, CCEAB/R/T/25/00188, CCEAB/R/T/25/00189 RTI applications filed by Shri Manoj Balkrishan Patil.
- III. The Superintendent (Systems), CCO, CGST & Central Excise, Ahmedabad Zone with a request to upload the information on the website.