



**The State Information Commission, Kerala**  
Punnen Road, Thiruvananthapuram-695 039.

Tel:0471 2335199, Fax:0471 2330920  
Email: sic@infokerala.org.in

**AP.No.222/2007/SIC**  
File No.2579/SIC-Gen-2/2007

Smt.P.G.Sujatha,  
Illrd Grade Overseer (Hr.Gr.)  
Kerala Water Authority,  
Chief Engineer's Office (SR)  
Vellayamblam, Trivandrum-33.

Appellant

**Vs**

Appellate Authority,  
District Collectorate,  
Thiruvananthapuram.

State Public Information Officer,  
District Collectorate,  
Vanchiyoor, Thiruvananthapuram.

Respondents

**ORDER**

Smt.P.G.Sujatha is the appellant in this case. She is a Illrd Grade Overseer of the Kerala Water Authority. The averments in the second appeal memorandum could be summed up as follows:-

As per the RTI Act, she had preferred a request in the Office of the Dist.Collector, Trivandrum on 1.11.2006. She had demanded copies of certain documents. Ext A1 is the copy of the request. As per Ext A2 she was asked to remit an amount of Rs.66/- towards the cost of the documents requested. On 21.11.2006, she had remitted the amount and photocopy of the cash receipt was marked as Ext A3. Copies were furnished to her but all the copies were photocopies without authentication of the same.

She demanded authenticated copies but the same was denied to her on flimsy grounds like Officer was on leave etc. Therefore, she had preferred an appeal before the Dist.Collector and the same had not been disposed off, and hence the second appeal.

***The question that arises for consideration is whether the requester is entitled for authenticated copies?***

It's an admitted fact by the appellant that she was provided with the documents requested for. The nature of the document was not a subject of discussion that falls within the purview of this appeal. The documents consisted of certain allegations against the appellant, Smt.Sujatha ,who was an inmate of Nalanda Working Women's Hostel., Nanthencode. Immediately on receipt of the application, Ext A2 intimation was given to her to remit the cost and fee for providing the information. The cost was remitted as per Ext A3. But the allegation was that she was provided with only the photostat copies of the document. The appellant was entitled for authenticated copies and for the purpose of authenticated copy she had preferred an appeal, the same was also pending with the appellate authority. There was no denial of authenticated copy. The remarks of the Appellate Authority would show that the appellant was asked to collect the authenticated copy from the PIO which she had not collected so far. Right to Information means right to authenticated information. Section 2(j)(ii) makes it clear that the informant is entitled for certified copies, In other words, authenticated copies.

**Therefore, the appeal is allowed and the appellant is directed to collect the certified copies from the PIO within 15 days of the receipt of copy of this order. The first Appellate Authority is directed to dispose off the appeal accordingly within 15 days of the receipt of this order and report compliance.**

Dated this the 4th day of September, 2007.