



**RIGHT TO
INFORMATION**

1

**STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION, HARYANA
SCO 114-115, SECTOR 8-C, Chandigarh.
Complaint Case No. 4 and 7 of 2014
Right to Information Act - under Section - 18**

Relevant Facts emerging from the Complaint:

Name of the Complainant	Sh. Harinder Dhingra, D4 A/7, DLF, Phase-01, Gurgaon - 122 002.
Name of the Respondent	1. SPIO-cum-Additional Deputy Commissioner, Gurgaon 2. SPIO-cum-Deputy Civil Surgeon (Hospital based authorization Committee on organ transplantation at Medanta the Medicity Hospital, Gurgaon) 3. SPIO-cum-Deputy Civil Surgeon (Hospital based authorization Committee on organ transplantation at Artemis Hospital, Gurgaon) 4. SPIO office of the Principal Secretary to Government, Haryana, Health Department
RTI application filed on	3.8.2013
Date of filing complaint	11.9.2013
Date of hearings by the Division Bench	5.3.2014 and 25.3.2014
Detail of Division Bench	Smt. Urvashi Gulati, SIC Shri Yoginder Paul Gupta, SIC

Facts:

Sh. Harinder Dhingra, the complainant filed two RTI applications dated 3.8.2013 with the State Public Information Officer (in short SPIO)/Medical Superintendent office of Hospital based Authorization Committee on Organ Transplantation, the Medanta Medicity Hospital, Sector 38, Gurgaon and the Artemis Hospital, Sector 51, Gurgaon. The complainant while exercising the right to information vide his aforesaid RTI applications sought the following information:

- 1) Kindly provide the detailed information about meetings held by the Hospital Based Authorization Committee on organ transplantation in Medanta Medicity and Artemis Hospitals since its inception after the Government of Haryana



**RIGHT TO
INFORMATION**

Notification number 46/3/95-5HB, dated 18th May, 2012 and 22nd September 2010;

- 2) Kindly provide the certified copy of attendance of the members of the Committee in the meetings since its inception;
- 3) Kindly provide the detailed information including all the relevant documents about the fee being charged from patient/donor/donee for according approval for Organ Transplantation by this Committee since its inception. The information is required for all organs;
- 4) Kindly provide the number of approvals accorded by the Committee since its inception;
- 5) Kindly provide copies of all records, documents, note sheets, manuscripts, records, reports, office memorandum, part files and files relating to convening of the Committee meetings since its inception;
- 6) Kindly inform with relevant details about the retention period of record in your office;
- 7) Kindly inform with relevant details as to under which rule the record has been destroyed, if it was?
- 8) Kindly inform with relevant details if the record is untraceable, who are the officials responsible for not maintaining it;
- 9) If you cannot give the whole information demanded by me, please give a part of the information which can be given according to Section 10 of the RTI Act, 2005.
- 10) If the information sought by me cannot be given to me please give me the certified copies of the law/bylaws/order/circular etc. under which such information is forbidden to the public.

Finding no information from the respondent-SPIOs, the applicant filed complaints dated 11.09.2013 with the Commission that the SPIOs-cum-Incharge of the Hospital Based Authorization Committees on organ transplantation have not responded even after the expiry of mandated thirty days as stipulated under Section 7(1) of RTI Act, 2005. The **Medical**



— Superintendent of Medicity Gurgaon informed that the Authorization Committee is not covered under RTI Act, 2005. The complainant prayed to penalize the SPIOs under Section 20(1) and has sought compensation of Rs. 5.00 lac from both the SPIOs besides seeking cost of litigation. He prayed that Hospital Based Authorization Committees on Organ Transplant at Artemis and Medanta be declared public authorities under RTI Act, 2005.

2. The State Chief Information Commissioner, in exercise of powers conferred in Section 15 (4) of the Act, constituted a Division Bench comprising Smt. Urvashi Gulati, State Information Commissioner and Shri Yoginder Paul Gupta, State Information Commissioner to consider and decide the matter.

The Division Bench (hereinafter called Bench) met on 5.3.2014 and heard Shri Harinder Dhingra, the complainant, representatives of the Artemis Hospital and the Medanta Hospital based at Gurgaon and Dr. Renu Saroha, Deputy Civil Surgeon, Gurgaon. The written submissions dated 5.3.2014 of the complainant, reply dated 4.9.2013 of Medical Superintendent of the Medanta and reply dated 5.3.2014 filed by the Company Secretary of the Artemis Hospital were taken on record. The Additional Deputy Commissioner, Gurgaon was represented by Dr. Renu Saroha. The Civil Surgeon, Gurgaon reported that some available information on record stands provided to the complainant vide letter dated 20.2.2014. The representative of the Artemis Hospital requested that he may be allowed to submit a detailed reply. It was felt that the SPIO/office of the Additional Chief Secretary to Government, Haryana, Health Department should also be associated with the enquiry. Hence the Bench adjourned the matter to 25.3.2014. All the parties were directed to be present on 25.3.2014 and put forth their stand.

1
3. On 25.3.2014, the following were present:

Shri Harinder Dhingra, the complainant;

Shri Sunil Malhotra, the SPIO-cum-Deputy Superintendent
(Health-II Branch) office of the Additional Chief Secretary to
Government, Haryana, Health Department;



**RIGHT TO
INFORMATION**

4

Dr. J.C. Garg, representative of Director General, Health Services through teleconference

Dr. Renu Saroha, the SPIO-cum-Deputy Civil Surgeon, Gurgaon

Shri Naveen Goel, Company Secretary, Artemis Hospital, Gurgaon;

Shri Animesh Sharma, Advocate on behalf of the Hospital based Organ Transplantation Committee Medanta, Gurgaon;

Ms. Richa Singh on behalf of Medanta Hospital, Gurgaon;

4. *Shri Harinder Dhingra*, the complainant submitted that the Government has constituted Hospital Based Authorization Committees for the Medanta and Artemis Hospitals at Gurgaon by issuing notifications dated 22nd September 2010 and 18th May, 2012, in exercising of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub section (4) of Section (9) of the Transplantation of Human Organs Act, 1994 (42 of 1994) read with sub clause (A) of clause (ii) of sub rule (2) of rule 6-A of the Transplantation of Human Organs Rules, 1995. The Hospital Based Authorization Committees for both the hospitals were constituted by notifications issued by the appropriate Government under the Central Act and rules made by the State Government, hence the said Committees are public authorities in term of Section 2(h)(d) of the RTI Act. There is an obligation on these public authorities to furnish information as well as to insure the compliance of the provisions of RTI Act, 2005. He relied on the Judgement of Punjab & Haryana High Court dated 18.11.2009 as rendered in CWP No. 17686 of 2009 titled *the Karnal Cooperative Sugar Mills Limited and others versus State Information Commission, Haryana* and affirmed by Division Bench in LPA 122 of 2010 on 8.9.2010. He also cited Judgement of Delhi High Court in WP (C) No. 876 of 2007 titled as *Indian Olympic Association Vs Veeresh Malik and others* decided on 7.1.2010. Kerla High Court in *Thalapalam Service Cooperative Bank Limited Versus Dhara Union of India & others* in 2010 (1) I.D. 83, the Allahabad High Court in case *Dhara Singh Girls High*



School, Ghaziabad Vs State of Uttar Pradesh and others 2008 (4) Civil Court cases 352 (Allahabad). Division Bench of Punjab & Haryana High Court in *DAV College Trust and Management Society and others versus Director, Public Instruction (Colleges), UT, Chandigarh and others* 2008 (2) SCT 543. *Principal M.D. Sanathan Dharam Girls College, Ambala City Vs State Information Commission, Haryana* 2008 (2) Law Herald (P&H) (DB) 1214. He further cited the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in cases *People's Union for Civil Liberties Vs. Union of India* 2003 (4) SCC 399, *State of UP Vs Raj Narain* 1987 (4) and *S.P. Gupta Vs Union of India* 1981 Suppl. SCC 87 wherein the Hon'ble Court has interpreted the fundamental rights enshrined in part III of Constitution and projected the significance of the right to know which is derived from the concept of freedom of speech. Hence the complainant submitted that the people of this country have a right to know every public act, everything that is done in a public way, by their public functionaries. Hence, he submitted that the incharge of the Hospital Based Authorization Committee be directed to respond on to the RTI applications filed by the appellant under Section 6(1) of RTI Act,2005, in the capacity of public authority.

5. *Shri Sunil Malhotra, the SPIO-cum-Deputy Superintendent (Health-II Branch) office of the Additional Chief Secretary to Government, Haryana, Health Department* placed on record the Government notifications No. 46/3/95-5 HB-II dated 22.9.2010 and 18.5.2012 vide which Hospital Based Authorization Committees on Organ Transplantation were constituted at Mendata and Artemis Hospitals.

6. *Dr. J.C. Garg, represented the public authority of Director General, Health Services, Haryana* and submitted that the transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act, 1994 was adopted by the State of Haryana vide notification dated 23rd July, 1996 which came into force from the date of its adoption by the State Legislature i.e. 1st March, 1996. Dr. Garg further submitted that both the Hospitals, Medanta and Artemis Hospitals, are registered to carry out organ transplantation. The certificate of registration was issued to Artemis Hospital on 2.7.2009 and to Medanta on 17.6.2010.



— The certification is valid for a period of five years. No Hospital can undertake any activity relating to the removal, storage or transplantation of any human organ or tissue or both for therapeutic purposes unless the hospital is duly registered under the Act. The Transplantation of Human Organs Rules, 1995 provide for creation of Authorization Committees. The rules provide that there shall be one State level Authorization Committee. Additional Authorization Committees can be set up at various levels as per defined norms. In metros and big cities, Hospital Based Authorization Committees are set up if the number of transplants exceeds 25 in a year at a particular transplantation center. The approval of the Authorization Committee is mandatory for organ transplant.

7. *Dr. Renu Saroha, the SPIO-cum-Deputy Civil Surgeon, Gurgaon* submitted that the complainant filed his RTI applications by addressing it to the SPIO / Medical Superintendent Office of the Hospital based authorization Committee on Organ Transplantation, Artemis and the Medanta Hospitals at Gurgaon. On the receipt of the Commission's notice she contacted the SPIOs to enquire about the receipt of RTI application dated 3.8.2013 but it was neither received nor diarized in the record of the Civil Surgeon, Gurgaon. However, on perusal of the RTI application appended with the notice, she contacted the Hospitals by writing a letter dated 12.2.2014 with the advice to make available the information. The information so received from these Hospitals, was furnished to the complainant vide letter dated 20.2.2014.

8. *The Hospital Based Organ Transplantation Authorization Committee Artemis Hospital, Gurgaon was represented by Shri Naveen Goel, Company Secretary.* He submitted that the Authorization Committee is not an Internal Committee of the Hospital but a Committee constituted by the Government of Haryana under the provision of the Transplantations of Human Organs Act, 1994 read with the Transplantation of Human Organs Rules, 1995. He also submitted that the venue of the meeting of the Committee is at Artemis Health Institute, Sector-51, Gurgaon due to the Statutory Provisions of the Transplantation of the Human Organs Rules, 1995. He further submitted that provision of the aforesaid venue is not even voluntary but required in

l
pk



— compliance of the provision of laws. The members of the Committee contribute equally before approving any organ transplantation case. The purpose of setting up of the Hospital Based Committee is to expedite the process of approvals and to avoid delays as delays could endanger the life of the patient. The role of the Hospital is limited to convening the meetings. The administration and functioning of Committee is not in the domain of the Hospital. Hence, the Committee created by notification by the Health Department would not confer a separate and independent status to the entity so that it can be considered a public authority under the provisions of RTI Act, 2005. The prayer as well as the relief sought by the complainant is contrary to the provisions of the RTI Act, and is misconceived. Neither the Artemis Hospital nor the Medical Superintendent of the hospital is a public authority. Hence, there was no legal obligation for the hospital to transfer the complaint to the SPIO-cum-Deputy Civil Surgeon, Gurgaon. However, without prejudice to the above averment, the information sought by the complainant is exempted from the disclosure under Section 8(1) (e) and 8(1) (j) of the RTI Act. The information cannot be disclosed to the third party. The representative of the Artemis Hospital also relied on the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Chief Information Commissioner Vs State of Manipur*, AIR 2012 SC 864 wherein it has been decided that information sought under Section 6 (1) of RTI Act, 2005 cannot be ordered to be supplied in a complaint entertained by the Commission under Section 18 (2) of the Act.

9. *The Hospital Based Organ Transplantation Authorization Committee Medanta, Gurgaon was represented by Shri Animesh Sharma, Advocate and the Medical Superintendent, Medanta was represented by Ms. Richa Singh.* The Medical Superintendent of the Hospital in his reply dated 4.9.2013 addressed to the complainant stated that the Medanta Medicity Hospital is not a public authority, hence, they do not have State Public Information Officer, nor is there any requirement to appoint any such Officer or the obligation to transfer the RTI application to the SPIO concerned under Section 6(3) of the RTI Act, 2005. Further, the Hospital Based Authorization



— Committee for Medanta as constituted by the Haryana Government consists of seven members out of which three are from Medanta. The complainant has not addressed the RTI application to any of the members of the Committee or to the Health Department which constituted the Committee. Furthermore, the Committee in question is not a separate public authority for the purposes of Section 2(h) of RTI Act. The Hospital is not the custodian of the information. Ms. Richa Singh, representative of the Hospital submitted during the hearing that the Hospital in question has no Secretariat to hold record of the meetings. The Hospital does not have a separate office in the name of Hospital Based Authorization Committee. Dr. Nalini Kaul, Member Authorization Committee vide fax dated 27.3.2014 also intimated that the Director General, Health Services, Haryana vide letter dated 8.11.2012 has devised a format in which Organ Transplantation Data for Medanta is furnished every month to the Director General. Before arriving at any conclusion about the Transplantation of Human Organs following information is required to be submitted for approval before the Authorization Committee:

- i) Forwarding letter by the Treating Consultant;
- ii) No Objection Certificate from the State Authorization Committee;
- iii) Format of Approval Letter of the Hospital Based Authorization;
- iv) Affidavit By Patient (Recipient) with his photo;
- v) Affidavit By Donor with his photo;
- vi) Affidavit By Donor's Legal heir / successor with Photo;
- vii) Donor Proforma and Recipient Proforma;
- viii) HLA/ DNA typing Result - to establish relationship between the Donor and Recipient;
- ix) Duly completed Form -1 (A/B/C) of the Act by the Donor;



RIGHT TO INFORMATION

- x) Duly completed Form -2 (A/B/C) of the Act by the Treating Consultant and the Surgeon;
- xi) Duly completed Form -3 of the Act by the Consultant Doctor;
- xii) Duly completed Form -10 of the Act by Donor administrator Recipient (Patient);
- xiii) Certificate Psychiatric Evaluation of the Doctor;
- xiv) Attest documents evidencing proof of relationship between donor and recipient Government issues photo identity card (Ration card/ passport / Election card / Pan Number / Driving Licence / any other similar Proof);
- xv) Proof of income of Donor and Recipient.

The relation between a Doctor / Hospital and a Patient is a fiduciary relationship, and it is incumbent on the Doctor or the Hospital to maintain the confidentiality of such record. This information relates to third party and cannot be disclosed. Hence, it is exempted under Section 8(1) (e) & (j). They relied on the judgements in *Chief Information Commissioner Vs State of Manipur*, AIR 2012 SC 864, *Rashmi Dixit Matiman Vs Birbal Singh* in CIC/SG/A/2011/002238, *Bijendra Singh Vs Dr. N Sitalaxmi* titled CIC/SG/A/2011/000360, *Secretary General, Supreme Court Vs S.C. Aggarwal*, 166 (2010) DLT 305 and *CIC, K. Ganapathy Vs Southern Railway Chennai*, CIC/OK/A/000043-AD. These citations were referred to support their stand.

DECISION:

10. It is a matter of record that the larger bench of the Commission vide its order dated 15.5.2013 in appeal case No. 4197 of 2011, 3534 of 2012 and 3876 of 2012 titled *Shri Harinder Dhigra and Shri Jagvinder Singh Vs Director General, Health Services, Haryana* has held that the Artemis and Medanta Hospitals at Gurgaon are not public authorities. However, the questions before us are;



RIGHT TO INFORMATION

- (i) *Whether the Artemis and Medanta Organ Transplantation Centers are registered bodies with the Government of Haryana;*
- (ii) *Whether the Hospital Based Authorization Committees constituted by issuing notifications dated 22nd September 2010 and 18th May, 2012, in exercising of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub section (4) of Section (9) of the Transplantation of Human Organs Act, 1994 (42 of 1994) read with sub clause (A) of clause (ii) of sub rule (2) of rule 6-A of the Transplantation of Human Organs Rules, 1995 are public bodies under Section 2 of RTI Act, 2005?*

On point (i) above, it is important to keep in mind that Organ Transplantation is a subject which must be dealt with great sensitivity. Advances of medical science have enabled the transplantation of organs with increasing success, but it is also a matter of common knowledge that there is a rampant under the table trafficking of vital organs. The trade takes place in the black market mostly with middle men negotiating transactions between sellers and buyers. Handsome monetary gains allure persons who are poor and jobless, with almost no assets or goods, to sell parts of their bodies. The Gurgaon kidney scandal is too recent to be erased from the public memory. The multimillion scandal was unearthed in January, 2008. The police arrested several persons for running a kidney transplant racket in Gurgaon. The CBI special court has convicted five of the Gurgaon kidney scam accused. The scope for unethical acts in the transplant process is fearsome. No other field of medicine has raised so many ethical, moral, legal and social issues as has organ transplantation. The Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act, 1994 was enacted to provide for the regulation of removal, storage and transplantation of human organs and tissues for therapeutic purposes and for the prevention of commercial dealings in human organs and tissues. It has been observed that despite



— having put into place a regulatory mechanism for transplantation of human organs, there has been a spate of reports in the print and electronic media about thriving human organ trade in India and the consequential exploitation of economically weaker sections of the society. On the increasing perception in civil society that the Act has not been effective in curbing commercial transaction in organ transplant and that it has thwarted genuine cases due to the complicated and long drawn process of organ donation, Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in its Judgement dated 6.9.2004 in *Balbir Singh Vs. Authorization Committee* constituted a Committee to examine the lacunae in implementation of the Act. The recommendations of the Committee were examined alongwith the recommendations of the Rajiv Gandhi Foundation. The draft guiding principles of organ transplantation by the World Health Organization were also taken into consideration. After a series of consultation with different stakeholders, the Act was amended in 2011. Section 9 (4) of the amended Act deals with the composition of the Authorization Committees and provides that the Authorization Committees shall be composed as may be prescribed by the Government from time to time. The State Government and the Union Territories shall constitute, by notification one or more Authorization Committees consisting of such members as may be nominated by the State Governments and the Union Territories on such terms and conditions as may be specified in the notification for this purpose. The Authorization Committee is empowered to grant approval or rejection of the applications by the donor and the recipient seeking approval for removal and transplantation of the human organ. Section 14 provides for the registration of hospitals engaged in removal, storage or transplantation of human organ and tissues or both. The Act provides that no hospital, unless registered under this Act, shall conduct or associate with the removal, storage or transplantation of any human organ. No hospital shall be registered under this Act, unless the appropriate authority is satisfied that the hospital is in a position to provide such specialized services and facilities and has appointed a qualified transplant coordinator. Transplantation of Human Organ Rules, 1995 deals with

9
gk



— composition of Authorization Committees. It provides for a State Level Organization Committee and additional Authorization Committees at various levels. It provides that Authorization Committee should be hospital based in metros and big cities if the number of transplants exceeds 25 in a year at the respective center. The hospital based Authorization Committee shall be constituted by the State Government. The senior most person officiating as Medical Director or Medical Superintendent of the hospital, two senior Medical Practitioners, not part of the transplant team, two persons of high integrity and social standing and Secretary Health and Director General Health or nominees shall be its members.

It is a matter of record that both Medanta and Artemis Hospitals are registered transplantation institutions. The Government of Haryana issued certificate of registration to Artemis Hospital on 2.7.2009 and to Medanta on 17.6.2010. It is also an admitted fact that Hospital Based Authorization Committees at Artemis and Medanta have been notified by the State Government.

Now, the question is whether both these Hospital Based Authorization Committees, constituted by notifications, are public bodies under Section 2 of RTI Act, 2005?

The definition of public authority as defined in clause (h) of Section 2 of the Act is extracted as below:

(h) **“public authority”** means any authority or body or institution of self-government established or constituted—

(a) by or under the Constitution;

(b) by other law made by Parliament;

(c) by any other law made by State Legislature;

(d) by notification issued or order made by the appropriate Government;

and includes any—

(i) Body owned, controlled or substantially financed;

(ii) Non-Government organization substantially financed,

*l
gk*



directly or indirectly by funds provided by the appropriate Government,"

The larger Bench of this Commission has already arrived at conclusion as stated in foregoing Paras that the Artemis Medicare Services Limited, Gurgaon and the Medanta - The Medicity Hospital does not fall under the definition of public authority as defined in Section 2 (h) of the Act. But it is a fact on record that Hospital Based Authorization Committee has been constituted by the State Government by issuing a Notification bearing No. 46/3/95-5HB, dated 18th May, 2012 and 22nd September 2010 by exercising of powers conferred by clause (b) of Sub-section (4) of Section 9 of the Transplantation of Human Organ Act, 1994 (42 of 1994) read with sub-clause (a) of clause (ii) of sub-rule (2) of rule 6-A of the Transplantation of Human Rules, 1995. These Committees have come into existence by virtue of notifications issued by the appropriate Government.

The Transplantation of Human Organs Rules, 1995 under Rule 6-F have given enormous responsibility to the Authorization Committees. Sub clause 6-F (j) reads as follow:

"Every authorized transplantation centre must have its own website. The Authorization Committee is required to take final decision within 24 hours of holding the meeting for grant of permission or rejection for transplant. The decision of the Authorization Committee should be displayed on the notice board of the hospital or institution within 24 hours of taking the decision. Apart from this, the website of the hospital or institution must update its website regularly in respect of the total number of transplantations done in that hospital or institution along with the details of each transplantation. The same data should be accessible for compilation, analysis and further use by respective State Government and Central Government."



— The Authorization Committee is also expected to maintain the record. It enjoins upon the Authorization Committee to interview the applicants for determining the eligibility to donate and the minutes of the interview to be recorded. It goes further to say that the interviews with the donors should be video-graphed. The reasons for rejecting or approving the application of the proposed donor should be recorded as its decision making process and the use of discretion should be judicious. A reading of the Act and the Rules makes it very clear that the intent of the law makers was not to shroud the proceedings in the veil of secrecy. It is difficult to agree with the response of the Medical Superintendent, Medanta that the Hospital is not the custodian of information. It is also difficult to agree with the oral submission of the representative of the Medical Superintendent, Medanta that there is no Secretariat serving the Authorization Committee. The Rule 6-E mentions that Secretariat of the Committee shall circulate copies of all applications alongwith annexures received from the proposed donors to all the members of the Committee. At the time of the meeting, the Authorization Committee is required to take note of all relevant contents and documents in the course of its decision making process. Medical Director or Medical Superintendent of the Hospital is listed as member of the Committee at the top. The same applies to Artemis Hospital.

p
gh

The RTI Act was enacted in order to ensure smoother, greater and more effective access to information and provide an effective framework for effectuating the right to information recognized under Article 19 of the Constitution. The preamble of the Act aims to promote transparency and accountability in the working of the every public authority. It also aims to create an "informed citizenry" and to contain corruption and to hold government and their instrumentalities accountable to be governed. This spirit of the Act must be borne in mind while construing the provisions contained therein. The Commission exercises the supervisory powers under Section 18 of RTI Act, 2005.

The facts of cases discussed supra and law, lead us to conclude that the Hospital Based Authorization Committees at Medanta the Medicity and



the Artemis, Hospitals have been created by notification issued by the appropriate Government and thus fall within the definition of 'public authority' in terms of Section 2(h) (d) of the Act. The creation of these Committees and their nature of the duties bring them in the ambit of Section 2(h). The Central Information Commission vide its order dated 15th March, 2009 in Parveen Kumar Vs. Central Empowered Committee constituted under the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, was also held to be a 'public authority' under Section 2(h) of RTI Act, 2005. There cannot be the justification for not appointing any SPIO to discharge responsibility and to fulfill the aims and objects of the RTI Act, 2005. In the absence of duly appointed SPIO and the Appellate Authority, a citizen is unable to submit a request to a public authority in exercise of his/her right to information. The Bench rejects the stand of the Medanta the Medicity and the Artemis Hospitals that Hospital Based Authorization Committees are not the public authorities and the provisions of the RTI Act, 2005 are not applicable to them.

The Medical Superintendents of both these Hospitals are hereby directed to designate SPIOs and the Appellate Authorities within four weeks of the receipt of this order and shall respond to the RTI applications as per the provisions made under the Act. Besides, the Medical Superintendents are also directed to comply with the provisions of Section 4(1) (b) of the Act by way of making voluntary disclosures on the subject mentioned in the said clause. This would enlighten the citizens as to how the provided services can be availed to save the life of human beings.

The complaints are disposed of as per above directions. Orders reserved and pronounced on 11th day of April, 2014.

To be communicated.


(Yoginder Paul Gupta)
SIC


(Urvashi Gulati)
SIC