

BEFORE THE REGISTRAR OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES – CUM – FIRST APPELLATE AUTHORITY UNDER
THE RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT, 2005.

First Appeal No 31/2025

Present : Thiru. A.ILANGOVAANE

Registrar of Co-operative Societies–cum-First Appellate Authority.

S. Sathiya Prakash Pieiree,
No.47, Mariamman Koil Street,
Vinoba Nagar, Lawspet,
Puducherry – 605 008.

>>>>> Appellant

Vs

- 1] The Deputy Registrar (Audit)-cum-Public Information Officer,
Co-operative Department,
Puducherry.
- 2] The Managing Director-cum-Public Information Officer,
The Pondicherry Co-operative Milk Producers Union Ltd,
Vazhudaoor Road, Kurumampet
Puducherry - 605009.
- 3] The Managing Director-cum-Public Information Officer,
The Karaikal Co-operative Milk Producers Union Ltd,
Karaikovilpathu, Thalatheru P.O.,
Karaikal - 609 605.

>>>>> Respondents

ORDER

(Issued under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005)

The appellant submitted an application dated 02.11.2025, under Section 6 of the Right to Information Act, 2005, (hereafter “the Act”) to the 1st respondent and sought for certain information pertaining to the Pondicherry Co-operative Milk Producers Union Ltd., (2nd respondent-society) and the Karaikal Co-operative Milk Producers Union Ltd., (3rd respondent-society). The 1st respondent transferred the application to the 2nd and 3rd respondent- societies on 05.11.2025 & 14.11.2025 respectively. Further, the application was also forwarded to the Dairy Section of this department to furnish the information sought by the applicant. The reply received from the Dairy section was furnished to the applicant by the PIO/1st respondent on 24.11.2025. The 2nd and 3rd respondent- societies furnished reply to the appellant vide letters dated 03.12.2025 and 13.12.2025 respectively.

2. Aggrieved by the response of the 2nd respondent-society, the appellant filed this first appeal dated 08.12.2025 (received in this office on 15.12.2025) on the ground that, the reply received was not satisfactory.

3. The response of the 1st and 2nd respondents were called for, vide notice dated 15.12.2025. The 1st respondent and the 2nd respondent-society has furnished their response vide letters dated 28.01.2026 & 21.01.2026 respectively (**Copies Enclosed**).

4. On perusal, of the response received from the respondents, it is found that:

(a) The 1st respondent has transferred the RTI application to 2nd & 3rd respondent-societies and the Dairy Section on 05.11.2025, 14.11.2025 & 14.11.2025 respectively. The reply furnished by the Dairy Section was furnished to the appellant vide letter dated 24.11.2025 by the 1st respondent. As such, the reply furnished by the 1st respondent is found to be appropriate.

(b) The 2nd respondent-society has replied that, *"the information sought by applicant is found to be compiled from various files/records and is not directly available. But as per the RTI Act, 2005 the Public Authority is not supposed to create information, or to interpret information or to solve the problem raised by the applicants. Further, the applicant sought multiple informations about the employees of PCMPU (Ponlait) and the said information sought which is found to be in an interlinked format and the applicant refers to G.O.Ms. No22 date 27.02.2009 which is not mean exclusively for PCMPU (Ponlait) Administration and the service conditions of the PCMPU (Ponlait) employees are governed by the Subsidiary Regulations of the employees of PCMPU and as such, the information sought by the applicant is found to be ambiguous and not appropriate for furnishing the same. Since the area of operation of PCMPU is only at Puducherry Region of Union Territory of Puducherry and therefore the details / information sought for other regions viz, Karaikal, Mahe, Yanam are not available at PCMPU"*.

In this regard, it is observed that, the response made by the 2nd respondent-society is found to be acceptable since the service conditions of the PCMPU is being governed by their own subsidiary regulations and also the information sought by the appellant is found to be interlinked for which the information needs to be collated and prepared separately which will consume much time/financial resources of the PCMPU and their area of operation is only at Puducherry region of the Union Territory of Puducherry. Accordingly, the response furnished by the 2nd respondent-society is found to be appropriate.

5. In view of the above submissions, it is found that, there exists no grounds for the Appellant to prefer this appeal and hence this first appeal is dismissed.

6. If aggrieved by this decision, a 2nd Appeal may be filed, under Section 19(3) of the Act, within 90 days, with the 2nd Appellate Authority, whose address is given below:

Central Information Commissioner
Room No.305.II Floor, "B" Wing, August Kranthi Bhavan
Bhikaji Cama Place, NEW DELHI-110 066.

Dated at Puducherry on the 3rd day of February 2026.



5/7

(A.ILANGOVANE)

Registrar of Cooperative Societies-
cum- First Appellate Authority

Encl: As Stated.

To:

1. The Appellant
2. The Respondents.
3. The Web Editor, Cooperative Dept., Puducherry.
4. The Stock File.