

**OFFICE OF THE FIRST APPELLATE AUTHORITY**  
(Appointed under Right to Information Act, 2005)  
**NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION**  
17-B, SRI AUROBINDO MARG, NEW DELHI-110016

November 14, 2025

Ref. Appeal No. NIL dated 15<sup>th</sup> October, 2025

Sh. Umesh Chand Prajapati  
C/O. Bhudev Singh  
H.N. 653 Vivekanand Nagar  
Ghaziabad PIN 201001  
(U.P.)  
Mobile No. 9999755663  
Email ID pmpumesh@gmail.com

Appellant

Vs.

Central Public Information Officer  
National Institute of Educational Planning & Administration  
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi-110016

Respondent

**ORDER**

- (a) The appellant has filed first appeal No. NIL dated: 15.10.2025 under Section 19(1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 in connection with Response Ref. RTI No. Nil dated 30<sup>th</sup> August, 2025 against the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO) (hereinafter referred to as Respondent) of the NIEPA.
- (b) The submission in the RTI Appeal is "denial of information under RTI".
- (c) The appellant in his Appeal made the following submissions that the:
1. National award should be given to the worthy candidates following transparent procedures and basis of qualified parameters should be publicly accessible to the tax payers including RTI applicant.
  2. The input and validation of all the input referred to the success parameters should be completely visible to general public including any R.T.I applicant too.
  3. When award given to any sportsman based on their own personal efforts are kept very transparent and every parameter is validated publicly then how this can be justified that awarding parameters of a national prize which is awarded to promote public welfare and good governance can be kept secret from the public.



4. As per RTI all the recommendation/appreciation given to the applicant which made him eligible to participate and also may have been major influencing factors of candidates success should be easily accessible to tax payers including RTI applicant too

5. The dissatisfaction of competent authorities, not to share asked information should be confined in the perimeter of section 8 (a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,i,j), apart from this, no new ground of dissatisfaction should be introduced, against the statement explicitly mentioned in the end of this section of RTI act 2005 that is,

"...Provided that the information which can't be denied to the parliament or a State Legislature shall not be denied to any person."

6. If dissatisfaction of competent authorities is justified then please share your justified ground with explicit fact of denial that asked information is not eligible to be shared even if asked in Star questions of parliament or of any State Legislature as part of any normal or Star question.

7. Any dissatisfaction of competent authorities should be considered unconstitutional if found in any way against the main soul of RTI Act i.e. promoting transparency in government functioning.

8. Decision of information officers should not be based on wrong interpretation of act's section as per their own convenience while it should be in accordance of preamble of the RTI Act's and its birth Objective.

9. Dissatisfaction apart from the reason mentioned in section 8 of RTI act, for not sharing certified copy of recommendation are again requested to reconsider to avoid any unconstitutional decision against my fundamental rights of RTI as awarded under Article 19 of the Indian constitution

10. As per the definition described in Section 2. (f,g,h,i,j), the asked certified copy of recommendations is completely constitutional.

11. In view of the RTI act section Obligations of public authorities 4.1.c, i.e. "Publish all relevant facts while formulating important policies or announcing the decisions which affect public:

Since any award given to any person increase his motivation to keep doing the same good things for which he has been awarded and since award given to the officers is given under innovation category for the welfare of the students therefore if officer got prize based on constitutionally fare recommendation/appreciation then there is no harm displaying those appreciation/recommendation to the public.

Contrary against any negatives impact, General public will be happy to see the factors of appreciation in the recommendation that how good their well-wisher officers is, how nicely drafted recommendation was given by the competent authorities to their loving officers.

As per my view the only objections of hiding recommendation may be to hide any information available in that Recommendation which is not constitutional.





Otherwise neither recommending competent authorities nor validating authorities should have any objections in sharing such a nicely written recommendation and if recommendation is given by very decorated officers then he should be daring enough to make his/her recommendation publicly visible and since officers are very much aware of everything then this recommendation definitely would be constitutionally correct and there will be nothing mentioned which could degrade national award pride and its importance.

12. This the very first example in the world history that record keeping agency who executed national award and is claiming that constitutionally and procedurally all the recommendations of national prize can't be shared to a tax payer under his fundamental rights of RTI.

13. Asking this information is preventative effort not to whistle for any wrong fact or not to draw any wrong interpretation regarding national award, not sharing information will give birth to multiple doubts and I may be in need to follow other constitutional means.

(d) The appellant vide email dated November 03, 2025 was informed to appear for hearing in the office of the FAA on 14.11.2025.

(e) The appellant had requested to appear online. Therefore, the meeting was conducted in online mode.

(f) The reply of the Respondent (CPIO) in the instant appeal is as under:

1. It is submitted that the information sought by the Applicant (Appellant here in after) in response to his RTI Application No. Nil dated 30<sup>th</sup> August.2025 was duly replied.
2. The contents as above made in the RTI reply stands as it is and are candid”.

(g) This office has carefully considered the application, the response, the appeal and the records made available and the matter was decided based on the material available on record.

(h) The FAA agreed to the submissions made by the CPIO in the instance appeal and the appellant also understood that the “How/Why/When” do not come under the ambit of RTI Act. Therefore, asking how and what are the parameters for the awarding cannot be answered under RTI.

(i) However, the First Appellate Authority (FAA) directs the CPIO to resend the documents pertaining to recommendations of the DM (State) that were earlier provided but not received by the appellant shall be sent through email.

The appeal is accordingly disposed of.

If the appellant is not satisfied with this order/ information provided, may file an appeal before Central Information Commission, Baba Gang Nath Marg, Munirka, New Delhi-110067 within stipulated time.

  
(Surya Narayan Mishra)  
First Appellate Authority

Copy to:

1. Sh. Umesh Chand Prajapati  
C/O. Bhudev Singh  
H.N. 653 Vivekanand Nagar  
Ghaziabad PIN 201001  
(U.P.)  
Mobile No. 9999755663  
Email ID pmpumesh@gmail.com
2. Central Public information officer  
National Institute of Educational Planning & Administration (NIEPA)
3. System Analyst, NIEPA– For publishing on the website