

Public as Banking Regulators

What is the issue?

\n\n

\n

- The latest PNB fraud case has highlighted the deficiencies in procedures and regulatory controls in the banking sector.

\n

- It calls for assessing the space for public in playing a regulatory role.

\n

\n\n

How does RTI help?

\n\n

\n

- Under the Right to Information (RTI) Act, applications were filed in 2011-12 before for RBI and NABARD.

\n

- The information sought comprised copies of -

\n

\n\n

\n

- i. inspection reports on banks

\n

- ii. details of action taken against banks in breach of the relevant laws and regulations

\n

- iii. advisory notes issued by the RBI to banks and non-performing asset accounts

\n

\n\n

\n

- However, RBI and NABARD denied information regarding these.

\n

- The denial of information was on the ground that disclosure would prejudicially affect the economic interests of the state.

- \n
- The reasoning was that this would cause loss of public faith in some banks.
- \n
- Also, the information had been received from the banks concerned in a fiduciary capacity (trustee).
- \n
- Hence, it could not be disclosed to third parties.
- \n
- Following this, the Central Information Commission (CIC) considered appeals from RTI applicants.
- \n
- Overruling, the CIC ordered the disclosure of a good deal of information.
- \n
- However, its decisions were stayed by High Courts.
- \n

\n\n

What was the SC ruling?

\n\n

- \n
- The decisions by the CIC were considered and upheld by the Supreme Court.
- \n
- The court ruled that regulatory bodies were not in a fiduciary relationship with the banks that had provided the information.
- \n
- The Supreme Court also rejected the argument that information disclosure would hurt the economic interest of the country.
- \n
- The judgment has also guided subsequent decisions of the CIC in such matters.
- \n

\n\n

What were the CIC's directions?

\n\n

- \n
- The CIC has also directed disclosure of following information in respect of wilful defaulters and absconders -
- \n

\n\n

\n

- i. amount disbursed
\n
- ii. grounds underlying the decision
\n
- iii. rate of interest
\n
- iv. collaterals obtained
\n
- v. the outstanding amount
\n
- vi. steps taken for recovery, etc
\n

\n\n

- \n
- This direction overrode the ground of the fiduciary relationship of banks with their customers.
\n
- The decisions are based on Section 8(2) of the RTI Act.
\n
- Accordingly, notwithstanding the exemptions from disclosure, certain information can be disclosed.
\n
- This is provided that the public interest in disclosure outweighs the harm to the protected interest for denial of information.
\n

\n\n

Why is public disclosure significant?

\n\n

- \n
- Institutions that take the responsibility of managing **public funds** are answerable to the people.
\n
- The argument that such information is the exclusive preserve of those in the government and regulatory bodies is baseless.
\n
- **Confidence of people** in financial institutions should not be sustained by hiding information concerning their wrongdoings.
\n
- On the contrary, people ought to have all the information, good or bad, to make **informed decisions** about dealing with them.
\n

- Above all, well-informed people can discharge the **role of a watchdog**.
\n
- This can be far more effective than all the regulatory bodies put together. This is because opacity deprives them of that role.
\n

\n\n

What should be done?

\n\n

- \n
- **Disclosure** - Any fraud in a financial institution or a case of wilful default is a matter of public interest.
\n
- Complete transparency concerning the amount involved should be made public.
\n
- Also, the factors and persons responsible for the loss should be made known to the public.
\n
- **Laws** - The RBI also restrains from disclosing the names of wilful defaulters to the public.
\n
- It is argued that doing so would affect the third parties.
\n
- Certain amount of confidentiality about the information was also claimed under provisions of the RBI Act.
\n
- Thus, the law on these issues should be clarified further as a result of future judicial pronouncements.
\n
- Laws that prevent disclosure of even essential information should suitably be modified, to have transparency in banking functions.
\n

\n\n

\n\n

Source: The Hindu

\n



SHANKAR
IAS PARLIAMENT
Information is Empowering