Journal of Positive School Psychology http://journalppw.com
2022, Vol. 6, No. 5, 896 – 906

Right To Information and Private Sector Funding for A Social Cause

[1]Purvish Jitendra Malkan, [2]Dakshita Sangwan

[1]Research Scholar, G. D. Goenka University, Gurgaon, India, purvish5feb@gmail.com
[2]Assistant Professor, G. D. Goenka University, Gurgaon, India

Abstract

It is a basic human right to have access to reliable and timely information. As noted by Michel Foucault, a well-known French philosopher, information is the most important aspect of knowledge. As a result of increased knowledge, men are better able to deal with the challenges of today's world. Therefore, the government has a duty to keep the public informed on a regular basis about what is happening in the government. The main purposes of RTI legislation is to provide residents of India with accurate information, to minimize corruption and to improve accountability in the operations of all public entities. Nonprofits organizations and other private institutions working for a social cause and getting substantial government funding may now fall inside the scope of the access to information law, which makes them liable under the RTI Act. In spite of decreasing inflows of foreign financing, the importance of private finance has increased as a result of donations from philanthropic individuals. Focusing on the RTI Act's core principles and its connection to good governance, this article examines RTI Act-related difficulties. It finishes with a number of important recommendations for the successful implementation of the RTI Act. Efforts have also been undertaken to compare RTI legislation in India with industrialized nations.

Keywords: RTI Act, Citizens, Governance, Privacy, Information.

INTRODUCTION

Everyone has an inalienable right to information. All of us have the right to free speech and communication in a functioning democracy. This right encompasses the power to manifest international perception as well as the ability to request, collect, and interchange info with government officials. Citizens in a civilised society may live a dignified life with the support of easily accessible and appropriate information. Furthermore, the right to knowledge is closely tied to effective governance. Good governance is defined by transparency, accountability, and responsiveness. “As a consequence, the right to information is increasingly being recognised as a critical instrument for fostering government transparency, accountability, and openness”. The people are the sole participants in a representative political system .

Thanks to the Right to Information Act of 2005, our democratic democracy has achieved significant progress. It reflects a shift away from insider information from authorities and toward open government, since the more individuals who have access to data, the more responsive the government is to community demands. Every Indian person has a right to know, and the government is responsible for informing them.

Citizens wanted to hold information about what their elected officials do with their money and in their name, therefore making data and information accessible to them is a necessary

aspect of the job. The Official Secrets Act of 1923 made information disclosure illegal, while the RTI Act ensures government openness today. Giving out government data to the general public was historically unusual, usually at the discretion of officials in a public expert, but the RTI demonstration now provides everyone the right to ask inquiries and get answers. Authorities will find it much more difficult to hide their degenerate practises as a consequence of the protest. Data availability will help in the discovery of unsuccessful strategy makers, which will benefit India's political, economic, and social growth .

In contemporary democracies, citizens have a right to know about government activities and policies that impact them. The core of a healthy democracy is well-informed citizens under a democratic government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Citizens who are well-informed and educated contribute significantly to a country's democratic principles. In a democratic society, the right to knowledge is a natural right that arises from the underlying premise of democracy and is recognised all over the globe.

Article 19(1) (a) of our Convention safeguards independence of opinion and communication, giving rise to the concept of transparent government. As per the Judicial Branch, the person who receives and disseminate material is encompassed in the freedom to democracy and available freedom. Article 19(1) (a) of the Law ensures the rights to free speech and publication that political agencies must be honest and the three mechanisms of the sovereign must not misled the population .

To encourage honesty, integrity, and efficiency in administration, every individual underneath the responsibility of government bodies must have a freedom to access. No national system can operate without democracy, and citizens' access to information about their administration's operations is the underpinning of personal responsibility.

Evolution of the Right To Information

The "Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted by the United Nations in 1948. The next stage was the signing of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights in 1966, (ratified in 1978) and everyone has the right to freedom of thought and expression, according to Article 19 of the Covenant, which includes the freedom to hold views without interference and the freedom to seek, receive, and transmit information and ideas via any media and without respect to borders".

The Prologue of our Charter, in keeping with the theme of the Universal Declaration of 1948, reflects a blood oath of its citizens and offer, amongst many other issues, freedom of opinion and voice to its citizens. Article 19(1)(a) of the Indian Provision ensures citizens the freedoms of speech and expression one of their constitutional rights in order to accomplish this lofty goal .

In Delhi, in the 1990s, the effort of drafting laws on the amendment gathered traction. In their 180th Assessment in 2002, the Parliamentary National commission and numerous other groups underscored any need for a true measures to defend openness to that choice, which eventually led to the implementation of the Freedom of Information Act, 2002. To encourage accessibility, clarity, and efficiency in public administration, the Original document of 2002 was introduced to ensure that everyone has secure exposure to this public maintained by public institutions .

The National Advisory Council, on the other hand, recommended that the law be amended to guarantee easier, more effective, and more widespread access to information. The following changes were made:

"a) the creation of an appellate boy with investigative powers;

b) sanctions for failing to submit information;

(c) safeguards to ensure maximum transparency and a minimum of exemptions".

To integrate these changes, the Indian Parliament passed the Right to Information Act, 2005. The 2002 Freedom of Information Act has been replaced and is no longer in effect.

The Right to Information Act of 2005, which permits anybody to request any publicly accessible information from a government agency, is a powerful instrument in Indian people' hands. It holds the government and its employees responsible to the public. The goal of the Right to Information Act of 2005, as per the Introduction, is to preserve data beneath government oversight, promote openness and integrity in federal programs, eliminate misconduct, and make states and their officials answerable to the population .

2.1 Request for obtaining information

According to Section 6 of the Right to Information Act of 2005, a man who wants to get material there under Legislation must submit a written or computerized petition to the PIO in English, Hindi, or the medium of instruction of the territory, describing the substance of the content required. Upon payment of any costs that may be required, the information will be supplied to the applicant (if the applicant does not fall into the below-poverty-line category). The applicant is not need to provide a reason for seeking the information or any other personal information outside that which is required to contact him .

When the PIO gets a Section 6 request, he or she must give the requested information within 30-days after receiving the request, and if the information is important to a person's life or liberty, it must be delivered within 48 hours.

2.2 The regulator has access to the information of private companies

Only the regulator has access to the information of private enterprises. Only the information that a business is obligated to furnish may be disclosed by regulators. However, not all of this data can be shared with the applicant. Some categories of information are excluded from disclosure under Sections 8 and 9 of the Act.

2.3 Application of the Act only on public servants

Because they were constantly reminded that any purposeful infraction of the regulations, social standards, or government business on there own piece could consequence in retaliatory action under the regulations of the "RTI Act, 2005 in Jitendra Singh vs. State of U.P., 2008 (2) AWC 2067", this proposed law has inculcated in community servants a devotion and an eagerness to adhere to the statutes and rules in the efficiency of their official functions. (All).

As a conclusion, it is clear and adequately established that, in the actual environment and regulatory status, only public and treasury enterprises are eligible under the RTI Act 2005. The RTI Act does not apply to private businesses. However, the Act expressly states that private enterprises' information can be obtained from their regulator, if one exists .

A humanitarian legislation is similar to a freedom statute. It should be taken with a grain of salt.

The Sharing of Information Act of 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act) was approved by India's senate to develop a realistic access to reporting system for consumers and to supersede the Right to Information Act of 2002. Under this Legislation, any person can gather answers from a public body, which is obligated to respond within thirty (30) days. The Act also mandates that all national bodies digitally transform their archives in terms of making them readily accessible .

The Freedom of Information Act's freedom to seek, receive, and transmit information and ideas by any methods, regardless of borders has gained a lot of attention in recent years. Approximately 70 countries have implemented complete Freedom of Information Acts, according to a worldwide study performed in June 2006. The laws of 19 nations apply to both government and private-sector information, whereas the laws of the rest only apply to government data. Individuals may access information from the government with some limits in countries where the private

sector has been excluded from the purview of freedom of information legislation, but they cannot acquire information from private organisations as a matter of right.

Corporate entities' engagement in public operations is vital in this era of globalisation and anti-nationalization, and establishing accountability via transparency in the connection between private and public authorities is necessary. By bringing the business sector within the access to information system, South Africa's Promotion of Access to Information Act of 2000 prepares to embrace a healthy experiment. However, under the aforementioned legislation, if a public authority has information about a private entity, such information may be accessed or revealed once the private body is given notice.

Right to Information in Private Bodies

Indian legislators did not specifically include commercial groups in the Act. Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission v. Sarbajit Roy , the Central Information Commission declared that, notwithstanding their privatisation, privatised public utility businesses are nevertheless subject to the RTI Act. The common misconception presently is that the RTI Act only applies to firms and organisations that get major government support or funding, but the fact is that the RTI Act applies to private businesses regardless of whether they receive large government assistance or funding .

Pursuant to Clause 8 (j) of the Act, it is reasonable to presume that: Knowledge that cannot be rejected to the Public Authority with which the Private Entity is registered shall not be denied to anybody.

As a result, the RTI Act applies to Private Companies through the Directorate General with whom they are established. It is critical to locate the government agency whom the private firm has established. Cross companies, for example, are registered with the Deputy Commissioner of Co-operative Nations, whereas banks are registered with the Reserve Bank of India. According to M.M. Ansari, Privacy Commissioner of the State Information Council (CIC), these businesses were legitimate as long as they disclosed to a watchdog or official authority.

According to the commission, unlike government organisations, businesses would not be compelled to appoint information officers to handle right to information requests. Applicants must file petitions with the relevant government agency. For example, the Telecom Regulatory Authority of India could provide information on telecom companies like Bharti Airtel, India's largest mobile telephony company; the Reserve Bank of India could provide information on banks; and the Securities and Exchange Board of India could provide information on brokerages and foreign investors active in stock markets .

Even if it is in the private sector, applicants have every right to request information on a private firm that reports to a government agency, Ansari noted. He also emphasised that only petitions that promoted the public good, rather than those that attempted to destroy a company's competitive edge, would be considered. Anyone may inquire about how much water Coca-Cola utilized where the water is coming from, but not about the sparkling product's recipe. If it is a disagreement about what is and is not in the national good, the council will arbitrate and decide.

According to several reputable sources, the act is underutilised when it comes to acquiring info about the financial market, but it does provide a framework for seeking tourism industry statistics.

Private Sector & The Purview of RTI: Detailed Analysis

A shining example is Ideal Road Builders (IRB), a private corporation that collects toll earnings from the bulk of Maharashtra's highways, including the Pune-Mumbai Expressway. It has been unable to gather figures on toll collection. Because they have a connection with a government body, citizens may get such information from the government

organisation. Despite hiring an independent engineering expert, STUP Consultants Pvt. Ltd., the Maharashtra State Road Development Corporation (MSRDC), the government agency in charge of toll collecting in this instance, has failed to keep track of the IRB's income. Citizens, on the other hand, demanded this information under the RTI Act, prompting the MSRDC to request toll collection statistics from the IRB on a year-by-year basis. Due to the burden of RTI inquiries that had previously gone ignored, one of the officials revealed that they had just recently sought information from the IRB .

Similarly, the Delhi Metro Rail Corporation is in charge of building metros that are being foisted on residents in a number of towns and cities throughout the nation without any planning (DMRC). Because the DMRC is a private company, all RTI requests are refused. The DMRC planned the Pune Metro in a catastrophic manner and presented a mediocre and shallow Detailed “Project Report (DPR)”. It is currently in the hands of the state government, which did not include funding for it in the current budget. The dispute surrounding this Rs10,000 crore infrastructure project was brought to light by an RTI request to the PMC, which would add to the chaos on Pune's already congested highways and become a significant tax burden for locals for many years. Public documents may therefore be accessible in private-public partnerships by sending a query to the 'public partner.'

The RTI Act's fundamental approach and attitude seems to be that people have a right to know where the government spends their money since the government works on their behalf (right to information). In my view, if the money provided for operational expenditures surpasses either 20% of operating expenses or Rs. 1 crore, the organisation should be considered receiving substantial funding' and comes within the definition of public authority.

Extending Right to Information Laws to the Private Sector: What's at Stake?

Because private sector information is more sensitive than government information, balancing the right to know with economic secrecy is more vital. This will need a very narrow specification of the exceptions, which might be challenging.

If information collected from a private entity reveals misbehaviour, the private body is obligated to make the necessary corrections. As a consequence, in order to maintain its market image, the individual owned sector may refuse openness expanding with no limits. Extending right-to-know legislation might increase the costs of data collection and distribution. One of the most typical critiques levelled at the extension debate is this. In addition, methods will need to be devised to guarantee that the information given is spin-free and presented in a manner that the general public can comprehend.

1. Thalappalam Service Co-Operative Bank Vs State Of Kerela ,

The Co-operative Organization has filed a writ suit in the Constitutional Court seeking to reverse the judgement of the National Intelligence Secretary. The lone member on the jury held that all co-operative companies incorporated within the Organizations Ordinance are governmental agency and must comply with the RTI Act. The verdict was reversed on review, and restrained views on the concept of governmental authority were embraced before a constitution court accepted a contribution. The judgment provided a wide understanding of social agency that might encompass co-operative organisations, as well as an obligation to cooperate with the RTI Act as a response.

The Judicial Branch of India was asked to rule on two important issues: a) whether a co-operative group qualifies as a government institution under section 2(h) of the Provisions Of the act, and b) whether a co-operative organization is obligated to furnish details needed by a civilian.

The Tribunal glanced at the legality of co-operative organisations underneath the Law to starting resolving the problems before the first

one. Especially, if they fall under the definition of the States in Article 12 of the Charter. Depending on its judicial decisions, the Judge determined that the amount of active or passive command over populations did not surpass the vulnerability assessment is the process, i.e., it is not substantial and all, and can therefore be referred to be a nation under Article 12. The Court, on the other side, believes that cooperating associations can nonetheless fit the definition of government authority.

The Court next went to the Provisions Of the act, which ensures citizens' capabilities provided by government agencies. A description of government responsibility may be found in Section 2(h) of the Right To information act. The important piece of the clause pertinent in this case, according to the Commission, was control or considerable support by an entity or charitable foundation. The Court first laid down the requirements for finding influence in this respect. Simple inspection or control of a group as such by a legislation or alternatively would not render such institution a government agency within the definition of Section 2(h)(d) I of the Right To information act, it said after reading court rulings.

The Tribunal then proceeded to define the term substantially sponsored which may also relate either with directly and indirectly financing. Palser v. Grimling (1948) 1 All ER 1, 11 (HL) stated that the term actual, prevailing, favourable, and authentic to a huge degree, not centrist, customary, excusable, and that the lending must be existent, prevailing, favourable, and authentic to a great extend, not medium or low, customary, manageable, but that the borrowing must be actual, existing, favourable, and true to a considerable extent, not moderate, ordinary, manageable.

In the case of NGOs, the Court stated that it is feasible to prove that an NGO has been substantially sponsored directly or indirectly by governmental money even in the lack of statutory control. Those organisations would fall under the term of public authority if the latter were to be implemented.

Moreover, the Judge determined that the burden of proving for proving that a victim is purchased, monitored, or markedly bankrolled, but that an NGO is significantly bankrolled wholly or partly by money collected by the public Authority, lies with the appellant asking for access data or the acceptable Administration, and can be investigated by the Governmental Publicly Available Official, Nation Ceo And Founder, State Chief Technology Agency, Regional Publicly Available Agency, and the State Public Knowledge Officer, State Chief Technology Council, State Chief Council, State Public Affairs Commission, State Chief Information Fee

The Judge has to strike the right balance both dissemination requirements and constitutional protections, the court concluded. The state party or official is not compelled to respond if the relevant evidence is intimate and does not relate to any public communication or concern. After combining all of these standards to the details of the matter, the Court found that pre companies recognized under the Co-Operative Company Act are not public authorities since they cannot be demonstrated to be managed, directed, or materially funded by the government.

Non-Government Organisations

The term non-governmental organisation (NGO) isn't defined in the Act in its entirety. When used in the Behave, nevertheless, the representation has obtained its own meanings and therefore must be considered in that frame of reference. The administration used to bankroll a multitude institutions that implement various charitable intelligence processes because those associations now and then operate commitments that are often institutional. The question whether or not a Nonprofit organization has gained major support from the functioning government may now be a fact that the national authorities must scrutinise under the RTI Act. A large portion of the funding for such an entity can come from funds provided by the proper officer, either

actively or passively. Even if the administration has no legislated control accented with oil - rubbed NGOs, it can be proven that a specialised NGO has been significantly bankrolled actively or passively by money provided by the public authority; in this case, the organisation will be covered by Section 2(h)(d)(ii) of the RTI Act. As a result, also companies that are not owned or run by the government but receive significant grant money from it will be considered public authorities. The Act's section 2(h) (d)(ii) .

The weight of evidence is on the claimant gathering answers or the acceptable Authorities to display that a victim is possessed, managed, or markedly sponsored, or that a non-government organisation is dramatically bankrolled actively or passively by funding received by the public Authority, and can be investigated by the National Intelligence Agency or the State Information Council, as the situation may be, when the issue comes up for account. A body or non-governmental organisation (NGO) is also entitled to demonstrate that it is not possessed, operated, or significantly supported wholly or partly by the proper authorities.

State Under Article 12 Visa-Vis Public Authority Under RTI

The reality that some bodies identified as governmental entity were not considered to be governmental under Article 12 adds to this. Despite the fact that the Organisation for Football in India was not determined to be a state, the Delhi High Court ruled the Indian Paralympic Federation to be a governmental agency based on the same relevant facts.

Furthermore, numerous higher education institutions have been ruled to be encompassed by the Act because they served a legitimate benefit and received significant subsidies from the administration.

However, when a precise circumstance is evaluated, the first sub-meaning part's may sound ambiguous. For illustrate, a group can be constituted as a paragraph of Article 12 but not as a government authority under Section 2(h)(d) (ii). The Delhi High Court's decision previously last year that the private tv public broadcaster Aaj Tak was entitled to legislative authority set an unusual precedent. The petition, a rape survivor, was also awarded five lakh rupees for invasion of her claim to seclusion and anonymity when the appellant news channel revealed her identify. .

A private news station would never have qualified as a ‘public authority’ under Section 2(h) based on the grounds articulated in the previous subpart (d). It has no constitutional or statutory status, receives no large grants-in-aid, and serves a purpose that is nearly entirely fulfilled by private empires today.

As the government service expands, it is assuming many of the administration's previously performed duties. This trend has been aided by increasing industrialization, privatization, and openness of the economy. As a corollary, the financial enterprise now has exposure to a considerable volumes of content formerly solely taken by authorities about public administration. Data pertaining financial institutions, telecommunications companies, schools, and academics, for illustration, can be discovered. As a reason, the absence of the private market from rights to know laws effectively means that consumers no longer have access to knowledge from some of these critical sources. The general publics request for the 2005 Access to Information Act to be broadened to the financial market is expanding, as the business economy's growing has left much information outside of the 2005 Act's reach. As a result, more private organisations, notably those involved in the construction and maintenance of hospitals, schools, recreation and sports trusts, are being brought under the ambit of the freedom to information law. To improve the efficiency of disclosure regimes, it is vital to extend right to information legislation to the private sector.

One of the most controversial areas of the RTI Act, 2005 has been the definition of a ‘public authority’. Back in 2013 CIC went on to declare political parties as public authorities under the RTI Act, since then the issue of

public authorities has been on the rise. The central government further proposed to amend the section to exclude political parties. With the act empowering the citizens The RTI Act establishes a legal foundation for inhabitants to gather intelligence underneath the influence of general populace governments by characterising state officials, make arrangements to request details from community courts, and attempting to impose consequences on elected politicians who refused to disclose information as defined in Section 2. (f).

The question of who is a public Authority? becomes a critical one. Recently, the PM cares fund was declared as free from the ambit of RTI applications, and hence information sought would not be available. This created and stirred many controversies. Consequently, as a result of such decisions, such incidents it is important to know what does the term public Authority really means. Section 2(h) of the act possesses an ambiguous question. Authorities and institutions such as schools, colleges, etc., which are widely considered to be private entities have been put under the RTI Act. In M.P Varghese v. Mahatma Gandhi University , Kerala HC held that Those organisations that receive economic assistance from the government fall beneath the jurisdiction of the government. The term state is defined in Article 12 of the Constitution in connection to the regulation of basic freedoms through judges, whereas RTI Act is designed to achieve the goal of delivering an efficacious template for implementing the right to information recognised in Article 19 of the Indian Constitution. .

Examining the act and analysing each portion of the act is one solution. The first section of the section defines authorities created under the Indian constitution, those established by laws and legislatures (such as the RBI, SEBI, and others), and those notified by the government.

The scope, as well as the confusion, expands in the second part. The second section focuses on ownership and financing. This allows for more questions to be asked instead of only a few being answered. The following are some of the issues that could arise as a result of this: (1) who owns what and what constitutes ownership; (2) what is meant by control; and (3) what is meant by significantly financed. As a result, both portions of the clause are subject to interpretation, causing a significant uproar in the legal system. The Delhi High Court's ruling in National Stock Exchange of India Limited v. Central Information Commission clarified that a simple establishment is insufficient to fall under the RTI Act's purview. This meant that, although meeting a condition for public power, corporations created under a statute would no longer be considered public authorities.

According to the Delhi High Court, limited businesses are not included in the definition. However, in Sarbajit Roy v. Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission , the Central Information Commission further reiterated that privatised public utility corporations remain inside the RTI Act, notwithstanding their privatisation, according to the judgement. This clears up some ambiguity. As a result, private entities that perform a public role will be subject to the RTI Act.

Section 2(h) primary purpose was to define public authorities; nevertheless, when read in conjunction with section 2(a), limited firms that are not involved in public welfare or function would be exempt from RTI unless and until they are sponsored by a appropriate public authority. The intention of the act becomes increasingly difficult to discern as the act is read further. Section 2 defines knowledge as any substance in any type, along with archives, reports, meeting notes, e-mails, thoughts, guidance, official statements, newsletters, instructions, timesheets, contractual, findings, articles, swatches, concepts, personal information substance hosted in any electronically stored, and data relevant to any private organization that can be retrieved by a public authority that under any legislation (f). Any evidence sought by the legislature, the cabinet, or any other general entity would presumably be present in the community sphere and susceptible to the legislation. This is supported by the addition to section 8 (j), which states that evidence that can then be rejected to Assembly or a State Assembly should not be

withheld to any people. Candidates have every right to ask questions about a private corporation that reports to an authority, even though it is in the government industry, .

This allows the general public to obtain information from governmental agencies to which private enterprises are required to report. Aside from that, publicly traded corporations in the stock market are also subject to RTI. SEBI has approved a set of standards for acquiring information from these businesses. In other words, the only way to get information on a private company is through its regulators. Only information that the corporation is required to provide can be provided by such regulators. Not all of this information, however, can be shared with the applicant. Sections 8 and 9 of the act exempt some types of information from disclosure.

Section 2(h) which emphasizes the incorporation of an entity. If an entity is private or public is decided how it came to be in the first place.

The second thing is how it is funded. Is it funded through a host of private investors or is it aided by some public authority? A substantial amount of financial aid by a public authority allows for even a private entity to come under RTI.

As stated above, Private companies engaged in public activities would be obligated to share their information through RTI. This means that an entity's activities can also determine whether they would be public under the RTI Act or not. This certainly helps as certain hospitals and other authorities engaged in such activities would otherwise be free from the purview of RTI are now questionable under it .

Furthermore, in Delhi Sikh Gurudwara Management Committee v. Mohinder Singh Matharu , Organisations coming during the first portion of the description from clauses (a) to (d) do not have to be extra materially subsidized or managed and owned by the central, the Delhi High Court held. With opposing views from different courts, there is no single authority that can be cited that has defined the section with complete precision. While some courts prefer to control some courts have preferred to object to blind supervision by public authorities. In terms of financing, even land allotment and subsidies come under financial aid. Courts while having implied that quantum of aid helps in identifying and defining public authorities, courts have refused to provide a fixed quantum of financial aid that can be taken into consideration.

Regarding the problems stated above with the interpretation, the courts have come into consensus regarding the following points:

- If a private company is engaged in public affairs or deals with a public issue or is engaged in public welfare, would come under the ambit of public authority and hence individuals would be able to request for information.

- If a company is being funded or receiving any sort of financial assistance or even governmental supervision or control, RTI would apply to them.

- If a company reports to a Power of the community and state, it is possible to seek information from the said authority instead of the company itself.

- If the information sought through RTI can be given to the government, Parliament, then it can be given out in the public domain too.

- If the company is run in partnership with the government then, RTI application seeking information from the government partner is possible.

- If a company has listed its stock in the stock exchange or government has bought their stocks, then the company would be under the ambit of RTI.

These are a few conclusions apart from the very obvious as mentioned in the RTI Act itself.So the conclusion that can be drawn is that on a broad basis limited companies would not fall near the shade of this act and hence would be protected from disclosing any information. But courts and the act have had varied interpretations that have caused certain

guidelines to exists on whether information from such companies is obtained by way of RTI.

Conclusion

As a result, the Freedom to Knowledge Act can be viewed as an instrument for effective administration and management accountability. It increases the administration's accountability to the people. It raises citizens' awareness of authority and offers them a say in judgement call. By increasing government transparency and openness, it promoted democratic philosophy. It reduces the likelihood of public employees engaging in corruption or abusing their positions of authority. Because the legislation is intended to benefit people, how it is implemented will determine its success. Citizens, non-governmental organisations, and civil society organisations must also actively participate, as do RTI staff cooperation, departmental integrity, and political will from government and elected officials.

RTI is a mechanism that has evolved over centuries to empower the public. In cases such as this, there needs to be more clarity over such laws. RTI promotes transparency, good governance, and accountability. To promote these things, the act itself needs to be much clearer to the general public on who is to be held accountable and for what. The legislation has brought the importance needed in the field of law. It has allowed the public to become aware of its power to question the government. It has instilled in community servants an innovative understanding of commitment to responsibility and a desire to follow the statutes and standards in the performance of their public business, as they have been given notice that any deliberate ignorance infringement of the provisions and the responsibilities they are scheduled to operate will now result in retaliatory action under the RTI Act, 2005.. There is sufficient clarity in the question, Do limited companies come under the RTI act? the answer is NO. But with innumerable circumstances that can change the answer, the people who are less educated or just the general public would not know this. RTI is a very basic human need and right and it needs to be safeguarded with better clarity. The very obvious loopholes in the act which can allow corruption among private companies need to be tackled.

References

[1] Baroi, H. S., & Alam, S. (2021). Operationalizing the Right to Information Act through e-governance in Bangladesh: challenges and opportunities. International Journal of Public Administration, 44(8), 685-698.

[2] Jha, H. (2018). State Processes, Ideas, and Institutional Change: The Case of the Right to Information Act in India1. Pacific Affairs, 91(2), 309-328.

[3] Singh, P. (2021). Fifteen Years of Right to Information Act in India: A Long Way to Go. The Age of Human Rights Journal, (17), 346-362.

[4] Jha, H. (2019). Untangling global-local linkages: The case of the Right to Information Act in India. India Review, 18(1), 32-53.

[5] Taak, S. (2021). 'Penalties' under the right to information act in India: An analysis. TRANS Asian Journal of Marketing & Management Research, 10(11and12), 3-10.

[6] Aslam, M. A. RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT, 2005 (INDIA): A TOOL FOR SOCIAL CHANGE IN INDIAN SOCIETY. EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR), 256.

[7] Kamble, B. (2018). Historical Background of Right to Information Act.

[8] Pulist, S. K. (2019). PERCEPTION OF ODL STUDENTS TOWARDS RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT 2005: A CASE OF IGNOU, INDIA. The Online Journal of Distance Education and e-Learning, 7(1), 41.

[9] Mandal, S. N. (2018). WORKING OF RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT 2005: AN APPRAISAL IN THE EXISTING PERSPECTIVES. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LOGISTICS & SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT PERSPECTIVES, 7(02), 3345-3363.

[10] CIC order No., CIC/WB/A/2006/00011, dated November 30, 2006.
[11] Chakraborty, S. (2019). Exemptions under Right to Information Act, 2005: A Critical Analysis. Supremo Amicus, 10, 317.
[12] KUMAR, D. P. A. ROLE OF RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT TO SECURE CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE AND DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES IN INDIAN POLITY.
[13] Kumar, S. Empowering People and Administration through Information Is a Challengeable Task a Case Study of Right Information Act.
[14] Narsaraj, K., & Reddy, K. R. (2021). CHAPTER-14 RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT AND GOOD GOVERNANCE. RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT Tool In Strengthening Democracy In India, 155.
[15] (2013) 16 SCC 82.
[16] Chakraborty, S. (2019). Exemptions under Right to Information Act, 2005: A Critical Analysis. Supremo Amicus, 10, 317.
[17] Narsaraj, K., & Reddy, K. R. (2021). CHAPTER-14 RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT AND GOOD GOVERNANCE. RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT Tool In Strengthening Democracy In India, 155.
[18] AIR 2007 Ker. 230.
[19] Pulist, S. K. (2019). PERCEPTION OF ODL STUDENTS TOWARDS RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT 2005: A CASE OF IGNOU, INDIA. The Online Journal of Distance Education and e-Learning, 7(1), 41.
[20] Writ Petition (Civil) No. 4748 of 2007.
[21] CIC/WB/A/2006/00011
[22] Jha, H. (2019). Untangling global-local linkages: The case of the Right to Information Act in India. India Review, 18(1), 32-53.
[23] Baroi, H. S., & Alam, S. (2021). Operationalizing the Right to Information Act through e-governance in Bangladesh: challenges and opportunities. International Journal of Public Administration, 44(8), 685-698.
[24] Delhi Sikh Gurudwara Management Committee v. Mohinder Singh Matharu LPA No. 606 of 2010, LPA No. 607 of 2010 decided on 12 September 2012 by Delhi High Court