

Analysing the Right to Information Act in India

'Democracy requires an informed citizenry and transparency of information which are vital to its functioning and also to contain corruption and to hold governments and their instrumentalities accountable to the governed', says the preamble of the Indian Right to Information (RTI) Act.

The act provides effective access to information for citizens of India, which is under the control of the public authorities. It promotes transparency and accountability in the working of every public authority. The Right to Information Bill, 2005 was passed by the *Lok Sabha* on May 11, 2005 and by the *Rajya Sabha* on May 12, 2005 and received the assent of the President of India on June 15, 2005 and came to force on October 12, 2005.

This Briefing paper analyses the highlights and the status of implementation of the RTI Act in India and also looks at similar laws in other countries.

Introduction

Citizens' Access to Information (ATI) is an essential step in ensuring transparency and accountability in government systems and processes. When a government is transparent, there is less chance for corruption and more room for accountability. That's why Freedom of Information Acts (FOIAs) are becoming standard good practice in the international arena. The RTI generally understood as the 'right to access information held by public authorities' is not just a necessity of the citizens; it is a precondition to good governance. To be specific, ATI makes democracy more vibrant and meaningful and allows citizens to participate in the governance process of the country. In particular, it empowers ordinary citizens, especially those in rural areas.

When people have ATI they naturally tend to make more meaningful decisions, raise informed opinions, influence policies affecting their society and even help shape a more assured future for the next generation. RTI has been recognised in Sweden¹ for over 200 years. Importantly, however, over the last ten years it has gained widespread recognition in all regions of the world. While related legislations were adopted only by 13 countries in 1990, this number has now grown to 85² and more, and similar such pieces of legislations are under active consideration in many other countries.

In India, RTI Act was introduced in 2005 and since then this law has proved to be a strong weapon in the hands of people, for ensuring transparency in government departments and containing corruption.

International Trend

The first RTI law was enacted by Sweden in 1766, largely motivated by the parliament's interest in access to information held by the King. The Swedish example was later followed by the US, which enacted its first law in 1966 and then by Norway in 1970. The interest in Freedom of Information (FOI) laws took a leap forward when the US, reeling from the 1974 Watergate scandal³, passed a strong FOI law in 1976, followed by several western democracies enacting their own laws (France and Netherlands 1978, Australia, New Zealand and Canada 1982, Denmark 1985, Greece 1986, Austria 1987, Italy 1990). By 1990, the number of countries with FOI laws climbed to 13. A big step forward was the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights in 2000, which included both freedom of expression and the right of access to documents.

By 2010, more than 85 countries have national-level RTI laws or regulations in force including the major developing countries like China and India. Of all these, Mexico has taken the lead with one of the best examples of a well-functioning FOIA in the world. The law passed in 2002 represents a vital element of Mexico's democratic transition, and became a model worldwide. A well competent governmental body (*Instituto Federal de Acceso a la Información*) is entrusted with the responsibility of implementation and overseeing the law. Handling over 200,000 requests in its first five years, have resulted in Mexico setting a new international standard for transparency legislation.

Box 1: World Bank's New Access to Information Policy

The World Bank implemented the first phase of its new policy on Access to Information on July 01, 2010, to increase its effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability. This new policy draws on India's RTI law and the US FOI Law, and positions the Bank as a transparency leader among multilateral organisations.

New information that will be available includes decisions of project concept review meetings, project supervision missions, and mid-term project reviews. It also includes a provision that will allow for the declassification of certain types of restricted information over time – after 5, 10, or 20 years – recognising that sensitivity of the information declines over time. It also introduces the right to appeal.

Source: World Bank

In Asia so far almost 20 nations have adopted FOI laws including Kazakhstan (FOI Act, 1993), South Korea (Act on Disclosure of Information by Public Agencies, 1996 adopted in 1998 and amended in 2004), Japan (Law concerning Access to information, 1999 came into power in 2001 and amended in 2003), China (Open Government Information Regulation, 2008 which came into effect in 2009) and Indonesia (FOI Law, 2008 which came into force in 2010). In South Asia, countries such as Afghanistan, Bhutan, Maldives and Sri Lanka, have not adopted any related legislations. Only Nepal (2007), Bangladesh (2009), Pakistan (2002) and India (2005) have such laws.

In Pakistan, the FOI Ordinance passed in 2002 has provision for fine upto R10,000 when complaints are deemed to be frivolous, vexatious or malicious by the Ombudsmen. In Nepal, the law requires public agencies to update and publish 12 different kinds of information(s) by themselves on a periodic basis. Likewise, in Bangladesh, request for information cannot be rejected on the ground of national security. Jordan is the only Arab country to have enacted a RTI law.

In Africa, the progress on the enactment of RTI laws has been more modest. The South Africa's Promotion of Access to Information Act, 2000 came into force in 2001 remains unique in Africa being the only such law that permits access to records held by private as well as public authorities. Followed by South Africa, Zimbabwe adopted the 'Access to Information and Privacy Protection Act, 2002,' though it is very weak. In three other African nations: Angola (Access to Administrative Documents Act, 2002 which was further amended in 2006); Uganda (Access to Information Act, 2005 which came into power in 2006); and in Ethiopia (Law on Mass Media and FOI, 2008 amended in 2010) FOI Acts were adopted which have been constrained by poor implementation.

Kenya's efforts to enact an FOI law dates back several years but in recent times has been most apparent through the publishing of draft FOI Policy and FOI Bill 2007 by the Government of Kenya in April 2007. The published bill has very progressive provisions, but its enactment is still awaited. In Zambia, a FOI Bill 2002 was placed in the Parliament but withdrawn in 2002 itself, with the government justifying the withdrawal on the basis that it wanted to consult widely on the Bill. The new Bill has yet to be reintroduced in the Parliament. The Constitution of Ghana guarantees the people, freedom of information. In Ghana, the FOI Bill has been drafted but not yet passed by the Parliament.

RTI in India

India's RTI Act is generally claimed as one of the world's best law with an excellent implementation track record. It is one of the most empowering and most progressive legislations passed in the post Independent India. From the day the Act came into force, enlightened citizenry had stated using the law by making information requests in order get the police to act or get their entitlements of food grain under public distribution system or expose the corrupt officials.

Most radical provision of the Act is that the information seeker need not to give any reason for it or prove his *locus standi*. Yet the task of implementing the law is not without major challenges. Lack of adequate public awareness, especially in rural areas, lack of proper system to store and disseminate information, lack of capacity of the public information officers (PIOs) to deal with the requests, bureaucratic mindset and attitude etc. are still considered as major obstacles in implementation of the law.

Background

Disclosure of information held by public authorities in India was governed by the Official Secrets Act (1923) enacted during the British rule. The Supreme Court of India had in several judgments prior to enactment of the RTI Act, interpreted Constitution to read RTI as the fundamental right as embodied in 'right to freedom of speech and expression' and 'right to life'.

The *raison d'être* for a gradual and strong evolution of RTI in India is primarily because of a group of villagers in central Rajasthan, mostly poor wage workers, asserted their RTI by responding against ghost entries in muster rolls, which was the sign of rampant corruption in the system, and demanding official information recorded in government rolls related to drought relief work. The movement spread to various parts of Rajasthan, leading to a nationwide movement for the RTI and related state legislations. Thus, it was states that took the first step by enacting RTI laws – Tamil Nadu (1997) Goa (1997), Rajasthan (2000),

Karnataka (2000), Delhi (2001), Maharashtra (2002), Madhya Pradesh (2003), Assam (2002) and Jammu and Kashmir (2004).

The demand for national law started under the leadership of National Campaign on People's Right to Information (NCPRI). The FOI Bill 2000 was passed in the Parliament in 2002 but not notified, hence, never came into effect.

The national campaign for RTI received a major boost when the UPA Government's Common Minimum Programme promised that the RTI Act will be made more progressive, participatory and meaningful. The National Advisory Council, which was set up to oversee implementation of the CMP since its inception, took a close interest in RTI. All this and many other factors, including pressure from the civil society groups led to the enactment of the RTI Act in India, which came into effect on October 12, 2005.

Right to Access

Any citizen, including overseas citizens of India and persons of Indian origin, can ask for information under this law. This right includes inspection of work, documents and records, taking notes, extracts or certified copies of documents or records, and taking certified samples of material held by the public authority or under its control.

Procedural Guarantees

A citizen, who desires to obtain any information under the Act, should submit an application to the PIO of the

concerned public authority. The application should be precise and specific with name and complete postal address of the applicant. There is no prescribed format of application for seeking information. The application need to be submitted along with an application fee as prescribed in the Fee Rules. Table I shows maximum time, which may be taken to dispose off the applications in different situations.

If a public authority fails to comply with the specified time limit, the information to the concerned applicant would have to be provided free of charge.

Duty to Publish

The Act, in particular, requires every public authority to publish 16 categories of information. This includes the particulars of its organisation, functions and duties; powers and duties of its officers and employees; procedure followed in the decision making process; norms set for discharge of its functions; rules, regulations, instructions, manuals and records, held by it or under its control or used by its employees for discharging its functions; etc.

Exceptions

The Act enumerates the types of information(s) that are exempted from disclosure.⁴ However, these exempted information(s) or those exempted under the Official Secrets Act can be disclosed if public interest in disclosure overweighs the harm to the protected interest.⁵ Also the exempted information(s) would cease to be exempted if 20 years have lapsed after occurrence of the incident to which the information relates.

Table I: Disposal of RTI Applications

Situation	Time limit for disposing the application
Information in normal course	30 days
Information concerning the life or liberty of a person	48 hours
Information if the application is received through APIO	5 days added to above time periods
If application received after transfer from another public authority: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In normal course Information concerns the life or liberty of a person 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 30 days of receipt by the concerned public authority Within 48 hours of receipt by the concerned public authority
Supply of information by organisations specified in the second Schedule: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If information relates to allegations of violation of human rights If information relates to allegations of corruption 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 45 days from receipt of application Within 30 days of receipt of application
Information relating to third party who has treated it as confidential	Provided after following certain prescribed procedure given in the Act under Section 11
Information where the applicant is asked to pay additional fee	Period between informing the applicant about additional fee and the payment of fee excluded for calculating the period of reply

Source: Right to Information Act, 2005

Appeals

If an applicant is not supplied information within the prescribed time of 30 days or 48 hours, as the case may be, or is not satisfied with the information furnished to him, he may prefer an appeal to the first appellate authority who is an officer senior in rank to the PIO. If still not satisfied the applicant may prefer a second appeal with the Central Information Commission (CIC)/State Information Commission (SIC) within 90 days from the date on which the decision should have been made by the first appellate authority or was actually received by the appellant.

Sanctions and Protections

Where the Information Commission at the time of deciding any complaint or appeal is of the opinion that the PIO has without any reasonable cause, refused to receive an application for information or not furnished within the time specified or denied the request for information or knowingly given incorrect, incomplete or misleading or distorted information it shall impose a penalty of ₹250 each day till application is received or information is furnished subject to the condition that the total amount of such penalty shall not exceed ₹25,000.

Summary of key provisions

Section 2(h): Public authorities means all authorities and bodies under the Constitution or any other law, and *inter alia* includes all authorities under the Central, state

governments and local bodies. The civil societies substantially funded, directly or indirectly, by the public funds also fall within the ambit.

- Section 4 I(b): Maintain and proactively disclose information.
- Section 6: Prescribes simple procedure for securing information.
- Section 7: Fixes time limit for providing information(s) by PIOs.
- Section 8: Only minimum information exempted from disclosure.
- Section 19: Two tier mechanism for appeal.
- Section 20: Provides penalties in case of failure to provide information on time, incorrect, incomplete or misleading or distorted information.
- Section 23: Lower courts are barred from entertaining suits or applications. However, the writ jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and high courts under Articles 32 and 225 of the Constitution remains unaffected.

Five Years of RTI – Where Do We Stand?

Five years of implementation of RTI Act has set the road to success and brought forth many issues – challenges and opportunities. Citizens, poor or rich, have applied for and obtained information under this law.

Box 2: Landmark Judgments by Central Information Commission

- **CIC asks UPSC to show marks to Civil Services aspirants**

The CIC directed the Union Public Services Commission (UPSC) to declare individual marks scored by 2,400 candidates appeared for the Civil Services Preliminary examinations in 2006 and ordered it to declare cut-off marks for each subject (CIC/WB order, November 13, 2006)

- **Record management to be improved by all public authorities**

Case: In the case of Paramveer Singh vs Punjab University, the applicant applied for information regarding the merit list for selection of candidates to a particular post in the university. However, no proper information was provided (CIC/OK/A/2006/00016, 15/6/06).

Judgment: The Commission held that every public authority, must take all measures in pursuance of Section 4(1)(a), to implement efficient record management systems in their offices so that the requests for information can be dealt promptly and accurately.

- **Property statements filed by civil servants are not confidential information**

Case: In the case of Shyam Yadav vs Department of Personnel Training, the applicant had sought details of property statements filed by bureaucrats (CIC/WB/A/2009/000669, June 17, 2009).

Judgment: The Commission held that property statements filed by civil servants are not confidential and information can be disclosed after taking the views of concerned officials as per the provisions of the RTI Act.

- **Set guidelines for redressing the grievances of citizens: decision given by CIC**

Case: In case of Ram Bhaj vs Delhi government, the appellant has sought information about whether the guidelines issues by the Department of Personnel and Training regarding disposal of public grievances with a specific time frame have been notified by the Delhi government (CIC/SG/A/2010/000537+000538/7492, April 19, 2010).

Judgment: CIC directed the Delhi government to inform the common man about the timeframe required to redress their grievances.

Source: Compiled from various sources

Box 3: RTI Victims – Just Naming a Few

- RTI activist Amit Jethwa was the latest to pay for exposing corruption with his life. He was gunned down outside the Ahmedabad High Court in July 2010. Jethwa had named an MP while exposing illegal mining on the Gir forest periphery;
- RTI activist Datta Patil was found murdered in Ichalkaranji in May 2010. Patil, had unearthed a corruption racket, which had resulted in removal of a deputy superintendent of police and action against Ichalkaranji corporation officials;
- Vitthal Gite, an education activist, was killed in Aurangabad in April 2010, who had exposed irregularities in a village school in Beed;
- Shashidhar Mishra of Begusarai in Bihar was murdered by unknown assailants in February 2010. Mishra had exposed corruption at the *panchayat* and block levels;
- Arun Sawant, who had filed many RTI applications in connection with the municipal corporation of Badlapur, was shot dead on February 2010.
- Vishram Laxman Dodiya of Ahmedabad had filed a RTI application to get details about the illegal electricity connection by a private firm. He was murdered shortly after a meeting with the officials of the company in February 2010.
- Sola Ranga Rao of Andhra Pradesh had filed many applications seeking information from the Mandal Parishad Development Office on the funds sanctioned and utilised for the village's drainage system. He was murdered on April 2010.
- Ramdas Ghadegavkar, 43-year-old RTI activist was found dead in August 2010 under mysterious circumstances after he exposed the sand mafia in Nanded. The death of Ramdas, who used the RTI Act, adds another name in the victim list of whistleblowers in the country.

Source: Compiled from various sources

Box 4: Protection for Whistleblowers

The issue of protection for whistleblowers caught the attention of the entire nation when National Highways Authority of India engineer Satyendra Dubey was killed after he wrote a letter to the office of the then Prime Minister detailing corruption in the construction of highways. Dubey's murder led to a public outcry at the failure to protect him. As a result, in April 2004, the Supreme Court pressed the government into issuing an office order, the Public Interest Disclosures and Protection of Informers Resolution, 2004 designating Central Vigilance Commission (CVC) as the nodal agency to handle complaints on corruption.

However, such unfortunate incidents kept increasing and brought renewed focus on the need for a law to protect whistleblowers. Thus, *Public Interest Disclosure (Protection of Informers) Bill 2010* was introduced in the Lok Sabha on August 26, 2010. The Bill seeks to establish a mechanism to register complaints on any allegations of corruption, willful misuse of power or discretion against any public servant. The Bill also provides safeguards against the victimisation of the person who makes the complaint.

Every governmental department and state-owned firm, including banks are obliged to have PIOs to handle RTI requests. With this openness of the government processes before the public, awareness among the masses has increased which, in turn, has brought accountability on part of the government, thus reducing corruption.

However, challenges still exist in the effective implementation of the Act. Some of them are: low level of awareness among people, lack of sincere efforts on

part of the government regarding capacity building of the PIOs and strengthening measures for SICs by appointing more commissioners. Applicants are often threatened and physically attacked when they go to submit an RTI application, or after submitting it.

Also full implementation of proactive disclosures of the RTI Act is yet to take place, though it may result in larger number of applications and consequent higher level of pending requests. There is no or inadequate mechanism within the public authorities to implement the provisions of the Act. Neither the government nor the information commissions have taken adequate steps to ensure compliance. In addition, the PIOs keep complaining of inadequate staff, fund and improper record keeping systems as the biggest stumbling blocks in providing requisite information to the public.

Overview of the Impact

In India, the Act has produced a better impact on the quality of the life of the poor and the marginalised. During the past five years, the Act has brought positive changes in the levels of corruption and accountability. There are quite a number of cases, where the Commission has ordered for providing the details of the decision making processes including file noting, cabinet papers, records of recruitment, selection and promotion of staff, documents pertaining to tender processes and procurement procedure, lists of beneficiaries of government subsidised schemes, such as food grains supplied through ration shops, water and electricity, domestic gas, educational and health facilities, shelter for poor, muster rolls under employment guarantee schemes, etc.

RTI Legislations – A Comparison

Table 2: India vs Developed Nations				
Country	Sweden	UK	US	India
Constitutional Protection	Protected	Not protected	Not protected	Protected (by interpreting)
Legislation	Freedom of the Press Act 1766	FOI Act 2000	FOI Act 1966	RTI 2005
Right of Access	Not limited by nationality or residence	Not limited by nationality or residence	Not limited by nationality or residence. But with exceptions	Limited only to citizens
Procedural Guarantees	Personal details of the applicant + reasons for request	Personal details of the applicant + description of the information desired	Personal details of the applicant + description of the information desired	Only contact details required
	No specific timelines, requests dealt quickly and promptly	Has a longer set of time limits	Special time limits apply to cases of compelling need	48 hour time limit applies to protect life or liberty
	No mention about transfer of requests or consultation with third parties	Direct transfers of request are permitted	No mention about transfer of requests or consultation with third parties. In practice, transfer of requests is common	Allow transfers of request
	Inspection of document provided free of charge. Rates apply when copies exceed nine pages	Contains two separate systems for fees, one for ordinary request and another for more complicated requests	Contains provisions relating to fees, distinguishing between commercial, educational or scientific institutions, and other requesters	Access upon payment of fee, including for information provided in electronic format. No fee for BPL
	When information refused, notice sent giving reasons	When information refused, notice sent giving reasons	Refusal notice includes name of the deciding official, quantity of information denied	When information refused, notice sent giving reasons and how to lodge an appeal
Duty to Publish	No obligation to publish. In practice, information provided via websites	No information regarding publication	Certain information published in the Federal Register, while others available for inspection	Extensive rules on proactive or routine publication and regular updates
Exception	Unique exception – relating preservation of animal/plant species	Contain rare or peculiar exceptions relating to the royal family	Contain rare or peculiar exceptions – relating to information about oil wells	Do contain rare or peculiar exceptions – information which would incite offence

The disclosure of such vital information(s) resulted in checking corrupt practices in delivery of services and ensuring the reach of entitlements to the poor. Concrete steps needs to be taken to make the filing of RTI applications more convenient.

Role of Government

Some of the recommendations regarding the role of the government as put forth by various studies⁶ are:

- Spell out specific responsibilities for implementation of specific provisions of the Act.
- Mass awareness campaign both at Central and state levels. Its main objective should be to increase public awareness; encourage citizen involvement; and increase transparency within the government.
- Direct all public authorities and training institutions to incorporate training module on RTI in all training programmes.
- Develop a consensus on a common set of minimum rules that would enable applicants from residing in one state to apply for information from any other state, without first having to find, study and understand the rules of each state and competent authority.

RTI Legislations – A Comparison

Table 3: India vs South Asia

Country	Bangladesh	Nepal	Pakistan	India
Constitutional Protection	Protected (by interpreting)	Protected	Protected	Protected (by interpreting)
Legislation	RTI Act, 2009	RTI Act, 2007	FOI Ordinance, 2002	RTI, 2005
Information about private bodies	Private organisation running on foreign or government funding/ exchequer; organisation undertaking public functions under contract with government or public organisation	Body receiving grants from the government; NGO running on foreign or government funding or international organisation	No provisions	Body owned, controlled or substantially financed and NGO funded directly or indirectly by the government; private bodies regulated by public authorities
Proactive Disclosure	Too limited. Allows only four kinds of information voluntarily	Provides for 12 kinds of information voluntarily	Too limited. Provides only five kinds of information voluntarily	Provides for 17 kinds of information voluntarily
Exemptions	20 exemptions	5 categories of exemption	4 categories of exemption + 9 exemptions related to the type of record. 5 additional grounds for refusal	10 exemptions + 1 additional ground for refusal (infringes copyright)
Public Interest Disclosure	No provision	No provision	No public interest override. Government can refuse to disclose in public interest	Exempted information's can be disclosed if public interest outweighs harm to protected interests
Fee Exceptions	Government in consultation with ICs may exempt from paying fee	No exemption	Fee as it may be prescribed but with aim of providing information promptly and at the lowest reasonable cost	Exempted for those below poverty line. Also free if the public authority fails to comply with time limits
Urgent Request	Relating to life and death, arrest and release from jail. Within 24 hours	Relating to defence of human life. Within 24 hours	No Provision	Relating to life and liberty of a person. Within 48 hours
Protection for Whistle-blowers	No protection to whistleblowers. Protection to officials for anything done in good faith under the Act	Partial protection provided	No protection to whistleblowers. Protection to officials for anything done in good faith under the Act	No protection to whistleblowers. Protection to officials for anything done in good faith under the Act. However, the Public Interest Disclosure (Protection of Informers) Bill 2010 is before the Parliament.

- Process of short-listing candidates for appointment to ICs must be participatory and transparent.

Conclusion

RTI is a powerful tool that can deliver significant social benefits. It can provide a strong support to democracy

and promote good governance, by empowering the citizen's ability to participate effectively and hold government officials accountable. Rather than just providing information, RTI Act in most of the countries has served to be an effective watchdog ensuring all those coming in purview of the Act to work in accordance with rules and regulations, without any irregularities.

However, stricter implementation of this law requires not only political will but also active civil societies, RTI activists and few key democratic features, such as respect for the rule of law. Currently, the RTI Act in India is passing through a decisive phase, much more needs to

be done to facilitate its growth and development. Mere protest against the lack of implementation of this law alone is not sufficient, one needs to encourage this initiative taken, for the law to grow and mature.

CUTS Work on RTI – A glance

- Integral part of the RTI movement started in the state of Rajasthan in early 1990s.
- Part of public hearings since 2002 and in 2004, CUTS formed Block Level 'Information & Advisory Committees' in Chittorgarh district.
- Organised an interactive session on RTI in New Delhi, on September 13, 2006.
- Actively involved in the National Seminar on 'One Year of RTI' organised by the CIC in New Delhi during October 13-15, 2006.
- In collaboration with Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, New Delhi, observed first anniversary of implementation of the RTI Act in the state with a seminar on 'One Year of RTI in Rajasthan' in February 2007. Along with CHRI, third and fourth anniversaries were also commemorated in Jaipur in 2008 and 2009 respectively.
- In collaboration with Partnership for Transparency Fund (PTF), Washington DC conceptualised a unique project entitled 'Combating Corruption in Rajasthan State, India, by Applying RTI Act as a Tool' during 2007-2008.
- Implemented a project entitled 'Reforming the Processes in the Rural Development Department through Policy and Civic Engagement, based on RTI Act 2005, in Rajasthan, India' (RePoRDD) in partnership with PTF during 2009-2010.
- Actively involved in the South Asia Regional Workshop on 'Towards More Open and Transparent Governance in South Asia' held from April 27-29, 2010.
- Member of Freedom of Information Advocates Network (FOIANET).

References

- Toby Mendel, Freedom of Information: A Comparative Legal Survey, Second Edition, United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation, 2008. <www.unesco.org/webworld/en/foi>
- Guide on Right to Information Act, 2005, Government of India. <<http://rti.gov.in/RTICorner/Guideonrti.pdf>>
- Article 19, The Public's Right to Know: Principles on Freedom of Information Legislation, International Standards Series, 1999, London. <www.article19.org/pdfs/standards/righttoknow.pdf>
- David Banisar, Freedom of Information around the World - A Global Survey of Access to Government Information Laws, Privacy International, 2006. <www.sspa.it/share/pagine/1635/global_survey2006.pdf>
- M. M. Ansari, Impact of Right to Information on Development: A Perspective on India's Recent Experiences, United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2008. <<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001865/186510m.pdf>>
- Alasdair Roberts, A great and revolutionary law? The first four years of India's right to information act, Suffolk University Law School, Revised March 2010. <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1527858>
- Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, Right to Information: International, Member States' Laws and Papers <http://www.humanrightsinitiative.org/programs/ai/rti/international/laws_&_papers.htm>
- History of Rising RTI in India <<http://www.nyayabhoomi.org/treatise/history/history1.htm>>
- Global Trends on the Right to Information: A Survey of South Asia. <http://www.article19.org/pdfs/publications/south-asia-foi-survey.pdf>

Endnotes

- 1 Swedish Freedom of the Press Act, 1766
- 2 ARTICLE 19 Welcomes UNESCO Declaration on Right to Information, Press Release, ARTICLE 19, 4 May 2010. Accessible at <www.article19.org/pdfs/press/article-19-welcomes-unesco-declaration-on-right-to-information.pdf>
- 3 The Watergate scandal was a political scandal in the US in the 1970s, resulting from the break-in to the Democratic National Committee headquarters at the Watergate office complex in Washington, D.C. Effects of the scandal ultimately led to the resignation of the President of the US Richard Nixon on August 09, 1974. The scandal became a driving factor in amending the FOI Act in 1976, as well as laws requiring new financial disclosures by key government officials
- 4 Section 8(1) and section 9
- 5 Section 8(2)
- 6 Understanding the "Key Issues and Constraints" in implementing the RTI Act, PricewaterhouseCoopers in association with IMRB, 2009. Accessible at <<http://rti.gov.in/rticorner/studybybypwc/index-study.htm>> & Safeguarding the RTI – Report of the People's RTI Assessment 2008, RTI Assessment and Analysis Group and NCPRI, October 2009. Accessible at <http://rti-assessment.org/exe_summ_report.pdf>

This Briefing Paper has been prepared by Simi T.B., Madhu Sudan Sharma & George Cheriyan of and for CUTS International.

CUTS CART Briefing Papers are to inform, educate and provoke debate on specific issues. Readers are encouraged to quote or reproduce material from this paper for their own use, but CUTS International requests due acknowledgement and a copy of the publication.

© CUTS International 2010. CUTS International, D-217, Bhaskar Marg, Bani Park, Jaipur 302016, India. Ph: +91.141.2282821, Fx: +91.141.2282485, E-mail: cart@cuts.org, Website: <http://www.cuts-international.org/CART/index.htm>