BEFORE THE GENERAL MANAGER AND FIRST APPELLATE AUTHORITY
INSOLVENCY AND BANKRUPTCY BOARD OF INDIA

7th Floor, Mayur Bhawan, Shankar Market,
Connaught Circus, New Delhi -110001
Dated: 10th November 2026

Order under section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) in respect of RTI Appeal Registration No. ISBBI/A/E/26/00050

IN THE MATTER OF

Ashok Upadhyay … Appellant

Vs.

Central Public Information Officer
The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India
7th Floor, Mayur Bhawan, Shankar Market,
Connaught Circus, New Delhi -110001 … Respondent

---

1. The Appellant has filed the present Appeal dated 28th October 2026, under the Right to Information Act (RTI Act). Due to administrative workload arising from unforeseen circumstances, same is disposed of within 45 days of receipt as enshrined under Section 19(6) of the RTI Act.

2. In the impugned RTI Application, the Appellant had sought the following information: -
"1. Please provide details of all personal insolvency resolution plans approved in India during the last 10 years where the total admitted claims exceeded 200 crores, including the name of the individual, total admitted claims, amount approved for repayment, percentage of recovery and percentage of haircut.
2. Please provide the year wise details of such cases, along with the name of the NCLT bench, date of approval and the relevant order/case number.
3. Please provide the creditor wise details in each such case, including the amount claimed, amount admitted and amount actually recovered under the approved resolution plan."

   In its reply dated 25.09.2026, the CPIO has replied that while the information is not maintained in the manner sought, the relevant information concerning personal insolvency resolution to corporate debtors is available on at *https://ibbi.gov.in/publication* . Aggrieved with the reply, the Appellant has filed the instant Appeal reiterating the request for information made in the impugned Application.

3. I have carefully examined the application, the response of the Respondent and the Appeal and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record. In terms of section 2(f) of the RTI Act '*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.*" It is pertinent to mention here that the Appellant's "*right to information'* flows from section 3 of the RTI Act and the said right is subject to the provisions of the Act. Section 2(j) of the RTI Act defines the "*right to information*" in term of *information* accessible under the Act which is held by or is under the control of a public authority. Thus, if the public authority

holds any information in the form of data, statistics, abstracts, etc. an applicant can have access to the same under the RTI Act subject to exemptions under section 8.

4. It is observed that the Appellant has sought a consolidated statement involving identification and segregation of cases on the basis of the threshold of admitted claims, year-wise particulars, individual creditor-wise claims, amounts admitted and amounts actually recovered. Such an exercise would necessarily involve collation and compilation of information from different records and sources. Since the information, as *"held by or under the control of any public authority"* under Section 2(j) of the RTI Act is available in the public domain, the CPIO is not obligated to maintain and furnish information in the manner as sought by the Appellant. Moreover, no larger public interest has been demonstrated for a direction to collate and compile the details of information as desired by the Appellant. Such exercise would defeat *'the practical regime of right to information'* as envisaged in the preamble of the RTI Act and would disproportionately divert the resources of IBBI under Section 7(9) of the RTI Act. In this regard, it is pertinent to refer the order of Hon'ble CIC in the matter of *Shri Praveen Agarwal vs. SEBI (Decision dated October 1, 2008):*

   "A public authority cannot be obliged to engage in it for the benefit of an applicant, who may not be the only and, the last such applicant. Many more would want to have this privilege which doubtless would lessen the applicant's research burden while increasing it for the public authority. Considering the fact that the information requested is unarguably in the public domain and that its range and volume is such that it would attract provisions of Section 7(9) of the Act, it is not possible to authorize its disclosure in the form in which the appellant had requested."

5. In view of the aforesaid, the reply of the CPIO does not merit any interference.

6. The Appeal is, accordingly, disposed of.

Sd/-
(Sanjay Manocha)
First Appellate Authority

Copy to:

1. Appellant, Ashok Upadhyay
2. CPIO, The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India, 7th Floor, Mayur Bhawan, Shankar Market, Connaught Circus, New Delhi -110001.