

[Com-Con] Background paper for RTI Convention in Orissa Saturday, 24 Oct, 2009 9:10 PM

From "Pradip Pradhan" <pradippradhan63@gmail.com>

To: focusorissa@yahoogroups.com, common-concern@googlegroups.com

State-level Convention on “Implementation of RTI Act in Orissa- issues and concerns”

Jointly orgd. at Red Cross Bhawan, Bhubaneswar, Orissa on 22nd and 23rd October, 2009

By “Right to Food Campaign, Orissa” and “NAMASKAR Organisation”

Dear friends,

As you know, to mark the occasion of four years completion of implementation of Right to Information Act, 2005 in Orissa, the Civil Society Organisations, RTI Activists, Journalists, advocates of Orissa High Court, concerned citizens had congregated in a State Convention organized by “Right to Food Campaign, Orissa” and “NAMASKAR Organisation” held at Red Cross Bhawan, Bhubaneswar, Orissa on 22nd and 23rd October, 2009. Around 200 participants, RTI Activists hailed from Bolangir, Boudh, Dhenkanal, Angul, Puri, Nayagarh, Kendrapara, Koraput, Sundargarh, Cuttack, Kalahandi districts had participated and reflected their experience and problems relating to implementation of RTI Act in their respective areas. Prominent figures in the convention were Mr. Prafulla Shamal, Minister for I and PR, Govt. of Orissa, senior journalists like Mr. Ramahari Mishra, Mr. Rabi Das, Mr. Prashant Pattnaik, Mr. Soumya Ranjan Pattnaik, Editor, Mr. Amar Satapathy, MLA, Mr. Panchanan Kanungo, former Minister, Mr. Raju Singh, State Secretary, JD(U), Mr. Karunakar Pattnaik, retired IAS, Mr. Achyut Das, Director, Atragamee, Dr. Bhagaban Prakash, prominent Civil Society Member, Ms. Supriya Pattnaik, Advocates like Mr. Biswajit Mohanty, Mr. Asish Mishra, Mr. Khirod Rout, Mrs. Usharani Behera, BGVS, Mr. S. .A Safiquee, Mr. Lalit Mishra, Orissa State Vigilance Council, Mr. Chitta Behera, expert had shared their views on four years implementation of RTI Act in the state.

In this convention, a back-ground paper on four years implementation of RTI Act in Orissa was circulated among the participants which is enclosed herewith for your reference.

A Booklet on “ **RTI in Orissa- Lost 4 years 2005-09: whys and hows**” has been published by **Right To Food Campaign, Orissa** which was also circulated in the convention. This booklet has made critical analysis how State Govt., Orissa Information Commission, Office of Speaker, Orissa Legislative Assembly have failed to implement the Act in letter and spirit. I will be happy to send the booklet to any person interested to get it. The cost of the Booklet is Rs. 30/- per copy.

Thanks,

Pradip Pradhan

S-74, Maitree Vihar

Post-Rail Vihar

C.S.Pur, Bhubaneswar-23, M-99378-43482

‘RTI Act in Orissa, Lost 4 Years (2005-09)’- A Presentation

On the Backgrounder of State Convention on “Implementation of RTI Act in Orissa- issues and concerns”, at Red Cross Bhawan, Bhubaneswar, Orissa on 22nd and 23rd October, 2009 jointly orgd. by “Right to Food Campaign, Orissa” and “NAMASKAR Organisation”

Our Overall Positions- An Overview

- Orissa RTI Rules 2005, State Government’s main instrument under the Act, described as absurd, ultra vires and anti-people, not only by us but by such RTI gurus as Aruna Roy, Shailesh Gandhi & Maja Daruwalla. It is the single greatest enemy of RTI Act in Orissa, and deserves to be abolished lock, stock and barrel.
- Orissa RTI (Amendment) Rules 2006, described by us as a welcome step in right direction, but orphaned and abandoned by both Government & Info Commission soon after its birth. It could be enacted on the floor of Assembly thanks to our consistent campaign coupled with honest efforts by a group of then MLAs from across the parties led by Mr.R.P.Swain
- Orissa High Court RTI Rules 2005, described by us as ultra vires U/S 28 and anti-people, that renders RTI Act still a non-starter in Orissa’s judiciary
- Absolute failure of Speaker Orissa Legislative Assembly, a Competent authority U/S 2(e-I), to implement a single step as required U/S 28 of the Act
- Failure of Governor to make suo motu disclosures U/S-4 and to implement the Orissa RTI (Amendment) Rules 2006 in his own office, to check the notifications by Govt of Orissa and High Court ultra vires the parent Act, to perform as a Competent Authority in respect of Constitutional bodies like Orissa Tribal Advisory Body, Orissa Election Commission & Orissa Finance Commission etc. U/S 2(e-iv), and to act as a penal authority against errant the Info Commissioners U/S 17 of the Act
- All-round failure of Orissa Info Commission in respect of its two major functions i.e. as an adjudicating authority on complaints and appeals U/S 18, 19 & 20 and as a reporting-cum-recommending authority U/S 25 of the Act
- The awareness-cum-monitoring functions of State Govt U/S 26 illegally hijacked by the Commission, resulting in utter negligence of its statutory functions on one hand, and preventing the State Government from discharging its due role on the other. The present image of the Commission is more of a funding and executive agency than that of a quasi-judicial authority.
- The net result of the dismal performance by all State actors including the Commission is a growing sense of frustration and apathy of the common people towards RTI Act compared to the scenario at national level and across States.

Our Non-negotiable objections against Orissa RTI Rules 2005

- It was suddenly notified by the Govt without seeking public opinion on the draft rules as required for a Central Act *U/S-23 of General Clauses Act 1897*
- The lengthy, 11-column Form-A (Application Form), which is made compulsory in Orissa and difficult to fill up by an average person is against the letter and spirit of the Act (*vide*

Para-19 of Guidelines for PIOs issued by national nodal agency for RTI through circular dated 27 Feb 2008)

- The mode of payment of application fees being only cash and treasury challan, not only the average person in Orissa is handicapped to make the payment, but also a person stationed outside Orissa is completely disabled to apply to any public authority in Orissa.
- The provision for attaching a copy of one's voter card or passport to the application form is not only a uniquely diabolic invention by Government of Orissa to put additional burdens on the applicants, but also designed to prevent the younger generation below 18 years from applying under RTI Act at all.
- The columns of Form-A seeking personal information such as permanent address, name of father/mother/spouse, and citizen identity are against *Section 6(2) of the RTI Act*, which explicitly prohibits the seeking of any personal information other than the contact details.
- The Form-B (intimation for payment) is illegal, since it doesn't provide for a break-up of the total amount demanded and particulars of appellate authority before whom, the appeal against the fees being exorbitant, if any could be made, as required U/S 6(3).
- The 9-column Form-C (Intimation of Rejection) is illegal on many counts, since it rejects an application under such dubious grounds as form not complete in all respects, identity not satisfactory, information available in a published material, and information available on the website. Moreover, its Col-9 that rejects an application saying '*For any other reason see overleaf*' gives a discretionary handle to any public authority to deny information to an applicant out of its sweet will and runs counter to the letter and spirit of the Act.
- The Form-D (1st Appeal) is illegal too, since neither the parent Act nor the Central Rule nor any other State Rule prescribes any compulsory format for the purpose.
- The Form-E (2nd Appeal) is also illegal for the above reason.
- The fees for 1st and 2nd appeals (Rs.20/- and Rs.25/- respectively) are illegal, since neither the parent Act nor the Central Rule nor any other State Rule prescribes any sort of appeal fees.
- Taking advantage of an ominous silence of Orissa RTI Rules on the fees towards the cost of information in respect of BPL families, the offices of both State Government and Orissa Info Commission have been illegally collecting information fees from them. Elsewhere in the country BPL persons are exempt not only from application fee, but also from any fee as mandated u/s 7(5) of the Act.
- Rule 10 (Calculation of cost of damage) of Orissa RTI Rules 2005, that requires the applicant to pay the damage for taking a sample under the Act is illegal too. As a result of this, not a single person in Orissa has so far applied for information in the form of sample.
- Orissa Notification dt 29th Oct 1005 on exemption of 5 security and intelligence agencies from purview of RTI Act under Section 24(4), is highly deficient for it fails to provide for access of information related to corruption and human rights violation as required under the said Section.

Why we call Orissa RTI Rules 2005 absurd and non-sense?

Rule 2(1-c) that defines the crucial word 'fee' as 'the amount payable by the applicant for obtaining any information under the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 6 and sub-sections (1) and (5) of section 7 excluding the cost of providing information' is a mindless and meaningless statement that renders the whole set of Orissa RTI Rules 2005 absurd and non-sense.

Confusion over role of State Government & Orissa Info Commission

- After notifying the Rules, constituting the Commission and issuing some Operational Guidelines the State Govt has stopped performing any function for enforcement, monitoring and promotion of RTI Act at different levels as required under Section-26, and employed the State Information Commission along with sumptuous funds as its only Super Contractor to carry out these functions.
- As a result, the Information Commissioners have been paying only lip-service to their quasi-judicial statutory functions like disposal of complaints/appeals and drafting of annual reports, and remained more seriously busy in distributing funds to their pet NGOs, organising so-called Suchana Shibirs, inaugurating and addressing meetings and rallies and distributing prizes etc. Such executive functions should have been performed by the State Government, as mandated under Section 26 of the Act.
- The so-called bilingual and multi-lingual translations of the Act and Rules and an FAQ in Oriya along with thousands of posters and leaflets for propaganda purposes, published by the Commission should have been undertaken by the State Government as per law (mandate of Section 26).
- Similarly the RTI training programmes should have been conducted directly by the Government as per the above mandate, not by the Commission.
- As a result of Commission playing the role of two-in-one, RTI in Orissa suffers from a triple loss- (1) State Govt or its nodal dept doing nothing on RTI front, (2) Commission neglecting its statutory functions of adjudication and report-writing, and (3) so-called awareness-training-cum-publication activities done by the Commission suffer from numerous unpardonable flaws, which are silly, idiotic and non-sense in nature.

Orissa Info Commission, costliest but dullest in the country

- Ironically, in the country's poorest State Orissa, Information Commission is the richest amongst all State Commissions. For instance, in 2007-08 State Commissions of Gujarat and Rajasthan could manage with only Rs.40 lakh and Rs.35 lakh respectively, while Orissa Commission squandered away a whopping Rs.2 crore 70 lakh, nearly 7 times that of Gujarat and 8 times that of Rajasthan. Assam, which has 2 Commissioners like Orissa, spent only about 46.5 lakh, which is about one sixth of Orissa Commission's expenditure. Even Karnataka, which has 3 Commissioners, spent only Rs.96 lakh, which is about two and half fraction of Orissa Commission's annual expenditure. Then Madhya Pradesh, which has 4 Commissioners spent only Rs.97 lakh in the same year. Even Punjab, which employs as many as 9 Commissioners, spent only Rs. 1 crore 10 lakh, which is Rs.1 crore 60 lakh less than the amount consumed by Orissa Commission.
- Though most expensive of all, Orissa Commission's performance in terms of its basic statutory function i.e. disposal of complaints and appeals is by far the poorest. For instance, one-member Commissions of Gujarat and Rajasthan disposed of 198 and 152 cases respectively in March 2008, while two-member Commission of Orissa disposed of a total of only 36 cases (11 appeals + 25 complaints) in the same month. It means, the efficiency of Gujarat and Rajasthan Commissions is about 5.5 times and 4 times that of Orissa Commission. On a further analysis, we find, in terms of individual capacity, one Gujarat Commissioner is equivalent to 11 nos. of Orissa Commissioners, and one Rajasthan Commissioner is equivalent to 9 nos. of Orissa Commissioners.
- Compared to the capacity level of Central Information Commissioners, Orissa Commissioners would show up as a molehill before a mountain. For instance, in Dec. 2008 two-

member Orissa Commission disposed of only a total of 48 cases (40 complaints+ 8 second appeals), which means that a single Commissioner could dispose of 24 cases per month, or roughly one case per day. But in the same month, one Central Commissioner Mr. Shailesh Gandhi disposed of 450 cases, or roughly 19 cases a day. In other words, one Shailesh Gandhi equals 19 nos. of DN Padhis or 19 nos. of Jagadanands. Though the fact remains, as per law, Mr. Gandhi is entitled to more or less same salary as that of an Orissa Commissioner (i.e. Mr. D.N. Padhi's Rs. 1 lakh 20 thousand, and Mr. Jagadanand's Rs. 1 lakh 13 thousand and 60 per month).

- Another paradox, Orissa Commission though poorest in performance, has the largest and most expensive bureaucratic machinery at its command. It has 35 nos. of personnel including 2 Commissioners (i.e. 1 Secy, 1 Registrar, 2 Law Officers, 1 Legal Facilitator, 1 Court Master, 1 Scrutinizer-cum-Shirastadar, 4 Personal Assistants, 3 Private Secys, 6 Data Processing Assistants, 1 Section Officer, 3 Asst. Section Officers, 6 Peons, 2 Drivers and 1 Sweeper-cum-Night watchman). Whereas the single member Rajasthan Commission, four times more efficient than Orissa Commission, manages with only 14 staff (1 Secy, 1 Registrar, 1 Administrative Officer, 3 Personal Assistants, 1 Reader, 1 Scribe, 2 Computer Operators, 2 Class-IV and 2 Security Guards). And the single member Gujarat Commission, which is 5.5 times more efficient than its Orissa counterpart manages with only 7 nos. of personnel. It is more intriguing to learn that Central Commission with 8 Commissioners, looking after 28 States & 6 UTs manages with 29 nos. of personnel, which is much less than that of Orissa.

- Thus, there is no tangible link between the number of Commissioners, staff strength or annual budget of a Commission with that of its performance. Having the largest staff and highest expenditure Orissa Commission has proved the dullest in performance, while with low budget and less manpower, State Commissions of Gujarat and Rajasthan have performed much better. Even the Central Commission runs its mega show with a slenderer manpower than that of Orissa Commission.

- What is wanted in respect of Orissa Commission is optimum output by each Commissioner in terms of case disposal along with a drastic cut in its extravagant budget and superfluous manpower, keeping in view the fact that Orissa is the poorest State.

Sub-standard & flawed decisions by the Orissa Info Commission

- **Faulty & erratic language-** Not only the Orissa Commission's rate of disposal poorest in the country, but quite a bunch of its decisions are simply unreadable due to faulty & erratic English. For instance-

1) CC No.439/2008 decided by SIC Jagdanand on 17.3.2009

“The State Commission is of the opinion that the information post led by the PIO has to considered as an important public interface point and should not be the made void at any point of time.”

2) CC No.991/2007 decided by SIC Jagadanand on 20.3.2009 in Circuit Hearing, Sambalpur

This Case is being heard on two different occasion on 26.8.08 and 19.11.08..... The Complainant today confirmed that he has received all the information from the PIO which he could belatedly received only after intervention of the State Commission. ... As both the cases are self-same. The case is covered with the case no-990/2007.

3) SA No.129/2007 by SIC (Prof.Radhamohan) on 4.1.2008

“2. Form A application dated 19.09.06 was received by the Public Authority on 26.09.06 and placed before the PIO on 13.10.06. This indicates that the administrative process is not RTI Act complaint.

“5. Since the first intimation was received by the Appellant within stipulated period of 30 days and also received complete information in the meanwhile there is no other point to pursue.”

4) SA Appeal No.7/2006 decided on 30 May 2006 by Chief SIC D.N.Padhi & SIC Prof. Radhamohan

“The Respondent further submitted that supply of the information sought for will be hit by the provisions of Sec (h) of the Act.” (*Is there a provision called Section (h) of the Act?*)

- Legally flawed decisions-

- (a) In most cases, no penalty against PIOs even if proved guilty (*For instances Vide Study Findings on Standard & Quality of Decisions of OSIC- A Report by Right to Food Campaign, Orissa 2008, and Ch-8 of RTI Act 2005 in Orissa, A Report 2008 by PRIA New Delhi*);
- (b) In cases where the penalty has been imposed, most of the penalized officers were the lowest rung officials at GP and RI level etc. Not a single OAS/IAS Officer holding the post of PIO has been penalized;
- (c) Except in a few cases, failure to compensate the aggrieved complainants and appellants who might have suffered loss or detriment;
- (d) Omitting the names of PIOs/Appellate Officers from some decisions apparently to shield them (*For instances Vide the above publications*);
- (e) Refusal to entertain the complaints against the failure of public authorities to make suo motu disclosures under Sec 4 (*CC Nos 3,4 &5 of 2006*);
- (f) In place of ‘first come, first serve principle’, arbitrary ‘pick and choose’ method for quick hearing and disposal of the complaints and appeals by the favoured persons in the name of ‘priority to public interest cases’;
- (g) Arbitrariness in registering and acknowledging the complaints and appeals
- (h) Excessive delay in holding the first hearing, next hearings and final disposal of cases (*For a discussion Vide the above publications*);
- (i) Failure to describe the facts of the case in a decision, leading to confusion among the readers of the decisions (*For instances Vide the above publications*);
- (j) Arbitrary and faulty interpretation of Act & Rules to collect fees towards cost of information from BPL families (*CC Nos. 11 & 22 of 2006*);
- (k) Arbitrary and faulty interpretation of Sec-7(1) Act and assert that mere response by the PIO (no matter information supplied or not) within 30 days of the receipt of application is enough to exonerate him from penalty. (*For instances Vide the above publications*).

OSIC’ Annual Reports: Bluff and Buffoonery all the way-

- Hollow Reports: In an apparent compliance to Section 25 of the Act, the Commission has displayed separate Annual Reports for 3 years (from 2005-06 through 07-08). But these Reports lack the very information, which Section 25(3) has made obligatory, such as-

- Number of applications submitted to each public authority in a State;
- Number of rejections and reasons thereof;

- Cases of disciplinary proceedings made against errant officials;
 - Amount of money collected by each public authority in the State;
 - Initiatives taken by public authorities to enforce the Act;
 - Administrative Reforms made by public authorities for better implementation of the Act.
- **No mention about Orissa RTI (Amend) Rules, 06 or Competent Authorities**
- None of the annual reports makes any reference to Orissa RTI (Amendment) Rules 2006, a landmark subordinate legislation passed by Orissa Legislative Assembly. Why? Perhaps, it is due to Commission's ingrained aversion against Section 4 of the Act, which is emphasized by the said Rules. Moreover, the Amendment Rules provided for an amended Form-A that contained a column on transaction through email. But the Commission itself even now recommends the use of the outdated application form on its website.
 - None of the Annual Reports informs anything about the implementation of RTI Act by such competent authorities in the State as Speaker OLA, Chief Justice Orissa High Court and Governor Orissa.
- **Misinformation-**
- A classic case of spreading misinformation by the Commission is on Page-13 of the Annual Report 2006-07, where it is mentioned inter alia Orissa passed an RTI Act in 2002.
- **White lies-**
- At page 16 of Annual Report for 2006-07 it is mentioned inter alia,** "About 61 thousand people visited the "Soochana Shibirs" held all over the State and 38800 R.T.I. applications were filed during the period mainly on the issues like allotment of houses under Indira Awas Yojana, B.P.L. Card issue, Land matters, Public Distribution System etc." But when asked to furnish under an RTI Application, district wise break-up of 61,000 visitors and 38,800 RTI applications, the office of the Commission simply refused to part with the information.
- **Dubious monetary transactions**
- In the Annual Report 2006-07, we find, out of a total of Rs. **20,137,000/- (RE) sanctioned to the Commission, only** the entry 'lump sum' accounted for **Rs.6,000,000/- (60 lakh)**. Again, in the Annual Report for 2007-08, out of a total of **Rs.2,69,15,000/- (RE)**, as much as **Rs.10,000,000/- (1 crore)** is just earmarked as 'lump sum' money. Only God knows, what does this 'lump sum' mean and to whose pocket or pockets it has traveled? Only a high-level enquiry by a Supreme Court Judge, to be commissioned by Governor Orissa under Section 17 of RTI Act may bring this shady entry into true light.

Orissa Info Commissioner in the company of private companies-

The Commissioners being quasi-judicial authorities themselves should stay focused on the statutory obligations entrusted to them i.e. adjudication and recommending-and- reporting exercises. In the earlier phase they diverted themselves to awareness-cum-training-cum-publication activities and thereby ill performed their own assignments. Now-a-days they are found intensively engaged with the private companies, which is a more dangerous trend. For instance, Mr.Jagadanand, State Information Commissioner has recently teamed up with Eastern Media and Tata Steel, which are as such private companies, and lauded their roles and services in so many words. The Commissioner ought to remember that he is a quasi-judicial authority and

keep his reasoned aloofness from all manner of private companies, who are potential culprits in the eyes of RTI Act, since they might have been 'substantially', 'directly or indirectly financed' by the Govt and thereby brought under the purview of the Act. We don't have any objection to a Minister attending such occasions, but certainly to a Commissioner, since it would dampen the spirit of citizens to lodge complaint before the Commission against the secretiveness of such private companies to disclose the necessary information about themselves.

Recent Notification by State Govt on NGOs under RTI Act

While it is absolutely necessary that all manner of NGOs (companies, cooperatives, officers' clubs, trusts, media houses, political parties and societies) who are 'substantially financed' 'directly or indirectly' by the Govt be brought under purview of the RTI Act, the Govt should first of all clarify what such expressions as 'Non-Government Organisations', 'substantially financed' or 'directly or indirectly' mean. In fact, in the Core Committee meeting held on 22nd Aug. 2005 chaired by the then Chief Secretary it was decided that the Planning & Coordination Dept. of Orissa would first develop the guidelines for identification of such NGOs. More than four years on, no such guideline has been prepared. In absence of such guidelines, the recent notification by Govt of Orissa, which is of a blanket nature, and made just 3 days prior to the retirement of the last Chief Secretary is like putting the cart before the horse and deserves to be withdrawn forthwith.

What we have done so far-

- **Soon after coming into partial force of RTI Act on 15 June 2005, we suggested to the State Govt on how to frame an ideal set of Rules under the Act.**
- **Immediately critiqued Orissa RTI Rules 2005 for its sudden notification violating pre-publication norms under General Clauses Act 1897 and for its absurd and anti-people provisions ultra vires the parent Act.**
- **Campaigned for drastic amendment of Orissa RTI Rules and enforcement of suo motu disclosures under Section 4 of the Act involving MLAs/MPs, media persons, academicians and eminent citizens.**
- **Launched website WWW.ORISSARTI.COM and linkage with national level RTI activist groups**
- **Welcomed the enactment of Orissa RTI (Amendment) Rules 2006 for its reduction of fees, provision for citizens' inspection under Sec-4, transaction through email and transparency on RTI applications transacted in each office.**
- **Critiqued the decisions and style of functioning of Orissa Information Commission right since it started working.**
- **Squarely condemned the Orissa Information Commission for its role as a funding agency and involvement of pet NGOs in its campaign package.**
- **Pressed the Orissa Information Commission to make suo motu disclosures under Sec-4**
- **Submission of Memoranda to Governor, Chief Minister & Orissa Info Commission on the need for drastic overhaul of objectionable Orissa RTI Rules 2005 and proper enforcement of Orissa RTI (Amendment) Rules 2006**
- **Critiqued Chief Justice Orissa High Court for the RTI Rules 2005 announced by him with provisions ultra vires the parent Act.**

- Critiqued the Speaker OLA, a competent authority, for his failure to bring out separate RTI Rules for the Assembly and for his mindless plagiarism of Sec-4 disclosures by Dept of Home into Assembly's website.
- Squarely condemned the Orissa Info Commission for hijacking the role of Govt under Sec-26 and also the State Govt for allowing such an act of hijacking.
- Critiqued the publications by Orissa Info Commission on Oriya translation of the Act and State Rules and an FAQ in Oriya for their gross and erratic omissions and commissions and published our own authentic Oriya versions for communication among the public.
- Organised series of awareness and training events at grassroots level for various civil society groups.
- Held State level Conventions on annual basis for review of RTI in Orissa and our own campaign
- Got involved in studies on RTI in Orissa by eminent national level groups like PRIA, New Delhi
- Critiqued the failure of Governor as a competent authority in respect of constitutional bodies like State Election Commission, State Finance Commission, State Tribal Advisory Body etc. and also in making suo motu disclosures about his own office under Sec-4
- Submitted and facilitated submission of Complaints to Governor under Sec-17 against Orissa Info Commissioners for their anti-RTI decisions and activities
- Promoted RTI discourse in Orissa based mail-groups like OREGS, Focus Orissa and Common Concern
- Critiqued Govt of Orissa's absurd and illegitimate notification on NGOs under RTI Act, for its failure to define the key words like NGO, 'substantially financed' and 'directly or indirectly financed'.
- Squarely condemned and lodged a Complaint under Sec-17 before the Governor against the Orissa Information Commission for their arbitrary act of allowing Mr.Jagadanand, Orissa Information Commissioner in identifying himself with private companies like Eastern Media Services and Tata Steel on different occasions.

Circulated by Right to Food Campaign, Orissa in the State-level Convention on "Implementation of RTI Act in Orissa- issues and concerns" held at Red Cross Bhawan on 22nd and 23rd October'2009. M-99378-43482, E-mail- foodrights@rediffmail.com