



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 9TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.G.S. KAMAL

WRIT PETITION NO. 30943 OF 2018 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

THE DIVISIONAL MANAGER
AND THE CENTRAL PUBLIC
INFORMATION OFFICER,
CANARA BANK, RTI ACT SECTION,
RECOVERY LEGAL AND FRAUD,
PREVENTION WING, HEAD OFFICE,
ANNEXE LIC BUILDING,
112, J C ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 002.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. T P MUTHANNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER
THE CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION,
ROOM # 302, CIC BHAWAN,
BABA GANG NATH MARG,
MUNIRKA, NEW DELHI - 110 067.
2. MR. R K JAIN
1512-B, BHISHM PITAMAH MARG,
OPP. ICICI BANK, DEFENCE COLONY,
VAZIRNAGAR, NEW DELHI - 110 003.

...RESPONDENTS

(R1 SERVED AND UNREPRESENTED;
NOTICE TO R2 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DATED 20.08.2025)

Digitally
signed by
SUMA B N
Location:
HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASH THE ORDER DATED 21.06.2018, ANNEXURE-A AND TO ISSUE DIRECTION NOT TO PROCEED FURTHER IN THE MATTER.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.G.S. KAMAL

ORAL ORDER

This petition is filed challenging the order dated 21.06.2018 passed by the respondent No.1.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the information sought for by the petitioner in terms of which, respondent No.1 has directed the petitioner herein to furnish the information sought for by the respondent No.2 within four weeks and to report the compliance.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner referring to Annexure-B, application filed by the respondent No.2 seeking information submits, that the information sought for are vague and not specific and pertain to the years spanning over 50 years. Therefore, the respondent No.1-Commission could not have directed the petitioner without referring to the



response/justification offered by the petitioner. He further submits in any event the information being sought by the private respondent No.2 is in respect of copies of the minutes of the meetings that were held by the Indian Banks' Association (IBA) which is located in Mumbai and the petitioner has no control over the said documents. As the said association in Mumbai is the custodian of all those documents. These aspects of the matter has not been considered by the respondent-Commission. Hence seeks for allowing of the petition.

4. Heard and perused the records.

5. The reply given by the petitioner refers to its inability to furnish the information on the premise of information sought for by the private respondent No.2 being vague and ambiguous. It is also submitted that the petitioner had become member of the IBA about 50 years back and since the information sought were very old it was not able to furnish the same. The respondent-Commission seem to have taken note of this response and come to the conclusion that the petitioner herein has not specifically denied the existence/availability of



such information. It is on this premise the respondent-Commission has passed the impugned order.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits given an opportunity, better response will be submitted to the respondent-Commission regarding documents sought for by the private respondent No.2 are in the custody of IBA and not with the petitioner.

Placing submission record, petition is ***disposed of***.

Matter is remanded to the respondent-Commission. The petitioner is at liberty to submit additional information/response to the respondent-Commission, which shall pass appropriate order in accordance with law after remand.

Sd/-
(M.G.S. KAMAL)
JUDGE