

**BEFORE THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND FIRST APPELLATE AUTHORITY  
INSOLVENCY AND BANKRUPTCY BOARD OF INDIA**

7<sup>th</sup> Floor, Mayur Bhawan, Shankar Market,  
Connaught Circus, New Delhi -110001

**Dated: 14<sup>th</sup> May 2025**

**Order under section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) in respect of RTI  
Appeal Registration No. ISBBI/A/E/25/00077**

**IN THE MATTER OF**

**Maanvi Sharma**

... Appellant

Vs.

**Central Public Information Officer**

The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India

7<sup>th</sup> Floor, Mayur Bhawan, Shankar Market,

Connaught Circus, New Delhi -110001

... Respondent

- 
1. The Appellant has filed the present Appeal dated 6th April 2025, challenging the communication of the Respondent, filed under the Right to Information Act (RTI Act).
  2. The Appellant had sought information pertaining CIR proceedings of Grand Ajnara Heritage Project (Ajnara Builder). The Respondent CPIO has replied that no information pertaining to the insolvency process of Grand Ajnara Heritage Project (Ajnara Builder) is available with it. The Appellant has filed the present Appeal stating that the Respondent CPIO has replied beyond the statutory timeline enshrined under Section 7(1) of the RTI Act. Since the Appeal required detailed analysis of different provisions of the RTI Act, same is disposed of within 45 days.
  3. I have carefully examined the applications, the responses of the Respondent and the Appeals 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. While the “*right to information*” flows from section 3 of the RTI Act, it is subject to other 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. In this regard, I note that the Appellant had filed the RTI application on 27<sup>th</sup> February 2025, which was disposed of by the Respondent CPIO on 17<sup>th</sup> April 2025. The deadline to dispose of the impugned RTI Application expired on 29<sup>th</sup> March 2025. Thus, the application has been disposed beyond thirty days of its receipt by the Respondent CPIO, which violates the timeline enshrined under Section 7 of the RTI Act. Being CPIO of Public Authority like IBBI, the Respondent should be sensitive to timelines and disposal

of information request. I would, therefore, encourage and urge the Respondent to consider the requirements of law while dealing with information requests under the RTI Act and dispose of RTI applications within the prescribed time.

5. However, in the interests of transparency and accountability, which are of paramount importance under the RTI Act. On careful perusal, it has been found that a company with similar name i.e., Ajnara India Limited (CIN - U01111DL1991PLC046358) has been admitted into insolvency by the NCLT, New Delhi bench *vide* order dated 20.09.2022. The details of the CIR proceedings of Ajnara India Ltd. can be accessed at <https://ibbi.gov.in/en/claims/inner-process/U01111DL1991PLC046358>. Since the details of the CD are available in the public domain, the Respondent CPIO is not obligated to compile and provide the information as enshrined under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act. In *Girish Prasad Gupta Vs. CPIO, Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd. Patna* (CIC/SH/A/2014/000787), the CIC observed that, *“the information, that is placed by a public authority on its website, is already available in the public domain and is, therefore, not under the control of the public authority. It can be obtained by any interested person by consulting the relevant website. If public authorities are required to provide hard copies of the information, already available on their website as part of suo-moto disclosure, such suo-motu disclosure will become futile, because the very purpose of such disclosure is to ensure that applicants do not have to approach public authorities to get a good deal of information already placed by them on their website.”*
6. The Appeal is, accordingly, disposed of.

**Sd/**  
**(Kulwant Singh)**  
First Appellate Authority

**Copy to:**

1. Appellant, Maanvi Sharma.
2. CPIO, The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, Mayur Bhawan, Shankar Market, Connaught Circus, New Delhi – 110 001.