

**OFFICE OF THE FIRST APPELLATE AUTHORITY**  
**(Appointed under the Right to Information Act, 2005)**  
**The Institute of Company Secretaries of India ICSI House**  
**C-36, Sector-62, Institutional Area**  
**Noida - 201 309 (U.P.)**

**Appeal No.00062/2025**

IN THE MATTER OF:

Mr. Abhisek Khandal  
Upper Telenga Bazaar, Cuttack,  
Cuttack, Pin:753009  
Odisha

Appellant

Vs.

Central Public Information Officer  
The Institute of Company Secretaries of India  
'ICSI House', 22, Institutional Area, Lodi Road,  
New Delhi – 110003

Respondent

Date of Order: 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2025

**ORDER**

- (1) The Appellant has filed first Appeal- No. ICSOI/A/E/25/00062 on 08.09.2025 under Section 19(1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 in connection with Response vide letter dated 26.08.2025 against the Central Public Information Officer (hereinafter referred to as Respondent) of the Institute of Company Secretaries of India.
- (2) The Appellant vide his RTI Application No. ICSOI/R/E/25/02328 dated 05/08/2025 has requested the following information:  
  
“Copies of Documents Related to complaint ICSIDC/1021/2024 required the following:
  1. Copy of the hearing written note of submission dt 08.05.2025 by respondent after hearing dt 22/04/2025 as mentioned in pt 28 of the final order dated 31/07/2025 in complaint DC/1021/2024.
  2. Copy of the Rejoinder filed by the respondent against the complaint DC/1021/2024.
  3. Copy of Source of Information for Pt 31 of the final order dt 31/07/2025 in complaint DC/1021/2024.
  4. Copy of the Hearing Video dt 22/04/2025 in case DC/1021/2024”
- (3) The Appellant has submitted in his instant appeal regarding the reply provided by the Respondent to the RTI queries as under:

“As per RTI application the authorities cannot deny any information as per point 1. Denied providing the document of hearing submission by respondent asked by complainant after

the disposal of the case which is not prohibited in any Act in India where RTI is applicable and here company secretaries Act 1980 and its disciplinary authorities come under RTI Act 2005 and should not deny directly to provide the document as the case has been disposed off. As per point 3 clarification was not asked only source of information/document was asked to provide on basis of which observation was made during order announcement and is basic need to know by the applicant under right to information Act 2005 which was manipulated and denied by authorities. I am aggrieved that the authorities refused to provide the information seeking for the further application which is as per RTI Act 2005 should be provided without denial and hindered my process to get justice at appropriate form”

(4) The reply of the Respondent against the instant appeal is as under: -

“We reiterate our earlier reply for point number 1 and 3 as under:

**Written submission to query number 1:** - “The Complaints of professional misconduct are dealt in accordance with the provisions of the Company Secretaries Act, 1980 and the Company Secretaries (Procedure of Investigations of Professional and other Misconduct and Conduct of Cases) Rules, 2007. Under the Act and the Rules, there is no provision to share the document after the disposal of the case.”

**Written submission to query number 3:** - “Information sought by the Information seeker is clarification in nature. Hence, not covered under the definition of information under Section 2(f) of the Right to Information Act, 2005.

Hon’ble Supreme Court in its judgment in Khanapuram Gandaiah Vs. Administrative Officer and Ors A.I.R 2010 SC 615 held that an applicant is entitled to get copy of the opinions, advices, circulars, orders, etc., but he cannot ask for any information as to why such opinions, advices, circulars, orders, etc. have been passed, especially in matters pertaining to judicial decisions. A judge speaks through his judgments or orders passed by him. If any party feels aggrieved by the order/judgment passed by a judge, the remedy available to such a party is either to challenge the same by way of appeal or by revision or any other legally permissible mode. No litigant can be allowed to seek information as to why and for what reasons the judge had come to a particular decision or conclusion.”

Therefore, the contents made in the RTI reply stands as it is and the appeal deserves to be dismissed.”

(5) This Office has carefully considered the application, the response, the appeal and the records made available and finds that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record.

This office concurs with the submissions of the Respondent in his reply to the instant appeal.

The appeal is accordingly disposed of.

Sd/-

(Asit Kumar Rath)  
First Appellate Authority

Copy to:

1. Mr. Abhisek Khandal  
Upper Telenga Bazaar, Cuttack,  
Cuttack, Pin:753009  
Odisha
2. Central Public Information Officer  
The Institute of Company Secretaries of India  
'ICSI House', 22, Institutional Area, Lodi Road,  
New Delhi - 110003
3. Directorate of IT - For publishing on the website