

**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.00070/2024**

IN THE MATTER OF:

Shri Ajit Prasad  
N.s.Coliery  
West Bengal – 713358

Appellant

Vs.

Central Public Information Officer (EXAM)  
The Institute of Company Secretaries of India  
C-37, Sector 62, NOIDA- 201309

Respondent

Date of Order: 20th July, 2024

**ORDER**

- (1) The Appellant has filed first Appeal- No. ICSOI/A/E/24/00070 on 03.07.2024 under Section 19(1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 in connection with the Response vide letter dated 24.06.2024 against the Central Public Information Officer (EXAM) (hereinafter referred to as Respondent) of the Institute of Company Secretaries of India.
- (2) The Appellant vide his RTI Application No. ICSOI/R/E/24/08122 dated 12.06.2024 has expressed concern regarding the insufficient time provided between the exams by the ICSI and requested for sufficient and logical explanation for this exam scheduling decision.
- (3) The Appellant has submitted in the instant appeal as follows:

“As per the information received from the CPIO, they say my application is interrogative in nature.

As per Black’s Law Dictionary the term interrogation applied when a witness or a suspected criminal is being questioned.

There is no such activity present in my case, this is the question of common students or teachers.

Further we are students of ICSI and we have right to know and my question is not interrogative in nature, it’s right to know as per Constitution of India and RTI Act 2005.

So we request you to please reply the sought information with adequate answer.”

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

- “1. It is to submit that the reply against the RTI Application ICSOI/R/E/24/08122 dated 12.06.2024 was provided to Applicant (Appellant hereinafter) vide letter dated 24.06.2024 in which the Appellant was informed about the interrogative nature of the information sought by him, as per section 2(f) of RTI Act and hence, no information was provided to him.
2. Further, in the instant Appeal, the Appellant has stated that the information is not interrogative and contested his Right to know as per constitution of India and RTI Act, 2005 and sought the same information once again.
3. This is to reiterate that the Appellant has just expressed his concerns, beliefs and opinions about examination schedule and presented his views on the same. Furthermore, the Appellant sought an explanation for the scheduling decision which does not classify as an information under the RTI Act, 2005.
4. Thus, no information can be provided to the Appellant under the provisions of the RTI Act, 2005.

The contents as above made in the RTI reply stands as it is and are candid.

Therefore, the appeal deserves to be dismissed in-limine.”

- (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. A PIO is not expected to provide explanation, which is intangible and cannot be said to be included in the definition of information in Section 2 (f) of the RTI Act

The appeal is accordingly disposed of.

Sd/-  
(Asit Kumar Rath)  
First Appellate Authority

Copy to:

1. Shri Ajit Prasad  
N.s.Colliery  
West Bengal – 713358
2. Central Public Information Officer (EXAM)  
The Institute of Company Secretaries of India  
C-37, Sector 62, NOIDA- 201309
3. Directorate of IT - For publishing on the website