1. 15434- SM 23/5/2011 1/11/2011

One Coop. Banks audit report and all that have gone into liquidation

Background proper

Denial a e and RR Patel- good

1. 15493 SG 24/6/2011 4/11/2011- **prefer 15434**
2. **Not 15743-Subhash Agrawal**
3. **16018-SG 29/6/2011 29/11/2011**

Prefer 15434

1. 16167 7/6/2011 7/12/2011
2. Derivatives 32000 crore loss

Prefer 15434

1. 16732 derivatives 11/10/2011
2. **17640- 18/11/2011** hearing 27/1/2012 12/3/2012

Stay orders reasons

US FOI and financial subsidy in US

SC CBSE case interpretation

1. The Commission rules that the information sought by the appellant does not fall within the exemptions of Section 8(1) (a), (d) or (e).
2. The Commission also finds that there is a larger public interest in disclosure of the information.
3. The Full Bench decision in *R.R. Patel v. RBI* is *per incuriam* for the reasons elaborated above. However, the Commission agrees with the observations of the Full Bench in Paragraph 21 as regards there being a larger public interest in disclosure of the information sought.
4. The Commission, being an adjudicatory authority set up under the RTI Act, must ensure that the right to information of citizens is effected but at the same time, specific interests mentioned in Sections 8(1) and 9 of the RTI Act are protected-as mandated by the Supreme Court of India in the *Aditya Bandopadhyay Case*. The limits are however set by the RTI Act as passed by Parliament.