Table of Contents

MERE PENDENC	CY OF FINAL DECISION IS NOT GOOD ENOUGH REASON TO DENY	
INFORMATION		1

Last update: 2017/12/06 blog:mere-pendency-of-final-decision-is-not-good-enough-reason-to-deny-information https://righttoinformation.wiki/blog/mere-pendency-of-final-decision-is-not-good-enough-reason-to-deny-information 03:04

MERE PENDENCY OF FINAL DECISION IS NOT GOOD ENOUGH REASON TO DENY INFORMATION

The Commission observed that even if the matter of misconduct proceeding is pending before the Ethics Committee, no reason nor justification had been given by the respondent as to why information cannot be shared about the current status of the complaint/appeal filed by the appellant and likewise about the status of suspension of Dr. Ketan Desai. In the event that the status of his medical registration has changed, the meetings when such decision to alter/change the suspension was taken is also not a piece of information which is exempt from disclosure under any of the provision of the under RTI Act. Mere pendency of final decision/examination/consideration of an issue is not good enough reason to deny information unless supported by valid reason and justification to substantiate that disclosure of the information would be detrimental to the interest of the Respondent.

Merely stating that the minutes of the Ethics Committee are quasi-judicial in nature does not make the same exempt under RTI Act, since there is no such provision under the Act. <html> <script async src="pagead2.googlesyndication.com/pagead/js/adsbygoogle.js"></script> <ins class="adsbygoogle" style="display:block; text-align:center;" data-ad-layout="in-article" data-adformat="fluid" data-ad-client="ca-pub-3082882621726443" data-ad-slot="9529004960"></ins> <script> (adsbygoogle = window.adsbygoogle || []).push({}); </script> </html> The Commission also directed the respondent to provide the basis for appointment of assessors who conduct inspections on behalf of the MCI. The qualification of the professors or associates who are assigned the task should be made available to the appellant as such disclosure about the qualification of Doctors/assessors etc. enhance the faith of patients and should thus be promoted by all means (CIC/YA/A/2016/001453, dated 9/1/2017) ~~LINKBACK~~ ~~DISCUSSION~~

