Journal of Socio-Educational & Cultural Research
International Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Peer Reviewed Refereed Journal
Published by Srijan Research Foundation, Varanasi India
DOI: https://doi.org/10.68868/14Js15aK44
www.jsecrjournal.in

Challenges in the Implementation of the Right to Information Act, 2005: Administrative, Institutional and Procedural Perspectives

Dr. Archana Singh
Assistant Professor, Political Science
Maharaj Balwant Singh PG College, Gangapur, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh, India
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0009-8352-1242

Abstract
The Right to Information (RTI) Act, 2005 created a statutory route through which citizens can obtain records held by public authorities and scrutinise the exercise of public power. Its democratic value lies not simply in the disclosure of documents, but in enabling people to question decisions, follow the use of public funds and assess the delivery of public services. Yet the existence of a legal entitlement does not, by itself, ensure that information will be accessible, complete or supplied within the prescribed period. Implementation is affected by administrative attitudes, uneven staff capacity, weak record systems, limited public awareness, delays in appellate institutions and inadequate compliance with disclosure obligations. These difficulties may be especially visible at district and local levels, where citizens seek information about land, welfare schemes, education, health and local development. This paper examines the administrative, institutional and procedural dimensions of these problems through a descriptive and analytical review of the RTI Act, government materials, administrative reform documents and selected published studies. It argues that effective implementation requires a connected set of measures: trained personnel, reliable records, meaningful proactive disclosure, accessible appeal procedures, adequately resourced Information Commissions and public education. The paper concludes that the practical test of the RTI framework is whether citizens can obtain usable information in time to exercise their rights and participate in public affairs.
Keywords: Right to Information; administrative transparency; public accountability; Information Commissions; record management; good governance; citizen participation.

1. Introduction

Democratic accountability depends on more than periodic elections or the formal existence of public institutions. Citizens also need opportunities to understand how decisions are made, how public money is spent and whether government programmes reach their intended beneficiaries. When official records remain inaccessible, administrative actions become difficult to examine and the relationship between citizens and public authorities is weakened.

The Right to Information Act, 2005 provides a legal framework for citizens to seek information from public authorities, subject to the exemptions and procedures contained in the legislation. It establishes responsibilities for Public Information Officers (PIOs), provides for time-bound responses and creates a two-stage appeal structure involving First Appellate Authorities and Information Commissions. In this way, the Act connects access to records with the wider principles of transparency, answerability and participatory governance.

The significance of the legislation is not confined to obtaining copies of documents. Information about expenditure, recruitment, welfare entitlements, public works and administrative decisions can help citizens identify discrepancies and seek explanations. However, statutory rights become meaningful only when institutions have the capacity and willingness to implement them. This paper therefore considers the gap between the legal framework and its everyday operation, with particular attention to administrative practice, institutional capacity and procedural access.

2. Objectives of the Study

1. To explain the contribution of the RTI Act, 2005 to transparency, accountability and citizen participation.
2. To identify administrative, institutional and procedural barriers that affect the timely disclosure of information.
3. To examine the responsibilities of PIOs, First Appellate Authorities and Information Commissions.
4. To consider how record-management practices and public awareness influence the practical use of the Act.
5. To suggest measures that can improve the accessibility and effectiveness of the RTI mechanism.

3. Research Methodology

The study follows a descriptive and analytical method and is based on secondary material. The principal materials considered include the Right to Information Act, 2005, the Right to Information (Amendment) Act, 2019, government guidelines and reports, administrative reform documents, and selected published research relating to participation, empowerment and digital communication. The material is examined thematically in order to identify recurring implementation concerns and possible administrative responses. No original field survey or primary statistical dataset has been used; accordingly, the discussion is an interpretive assessment of documented issues rather than a measurement of implementation outcomes.

4. Significance of the Right to Information Act, 2005

4.1 Making administrative action more visible

Access to official records allows citizens to examine the basis on which public authorities have acted. Disclosure of rules, procedures, decisions and expenditure can reduce unnecessary secrecy and make administrative processes easier to understand. Transparency is most useful when information is accurate, current and presented in a form that ordinary applicants can interpret.

4.2 Enabling public accountability

The availability of records makes it possible to compare official action with stated rules and responsibilities. Citizens may use information to ask whether a service was delivered, whether a selection followed the announced criteria or whether public funds were spent for the stated purpose. The Act does not replace other accountability institutions, but it can provide evidence that supports scrutiny and follow-up.

4.3 Supporting the detection of irregularities

Records concerning public expenditure, procurement, beneficiary selection and development works can assist citizens and community groups in identifying inconsistencies that warrant explanation. Access to information can complement social audits and other oversight processes. Research on collective participation and women's empowerment similarly points to the importance of information and organised engagement in community decision-making (Mishra & Kashyap, 2024; Mishra & Kashyap, 2026).

4.4 Widening citizen participation

Participation is difficult when people do not know what decisions have been taken or which authority is responsible. Information can help individuals and groups engage more effectively with local institutions, raise specific questions and follow up on public commitments. The value of access is therefore both individual and collective.

4.5 Improving awareness of public services

Information about pensions, scholarships, ration distribution, employment programmes and local infrastructure can help people understand the procedures and conditions attached to public services. It may also help applicants identify where a delay has occurred and which office is responsible for the next step.

5. Major Challenges in the Implementation of the RTI Act

5.1 Administrative reluctance and a culture of secrecy

A recurring difficulty is the persistence of administrative habits in which disclosure is treated as an exception rather than a normal public duty. Some officials may regard an information request as an unwelcome addition to their workload or as a challenge to their authority. Such attitudes can appear in vague replies, avoidable objections, incomplete searches or delays. The problem is organisational as well as individual: where offices do not value documentation and openness, formal legal duties may receive limited practical attention. Senior administrators therefore need to communicate that lawful disclosure is part of routine public service.

5.2 Gaps in the preparation of Public Information Officers

PIOs must understand the scope of the Act, applicable exemptions, time limits, fee provisions, transfer of applications and appeal arrangements. They also need to locate records held by different sections and communicate decisions clearly. If officers receive little practical training, mistakes may lead to incomplete replies and avoidable appeals. In many offices, RTI work is assigned in addition to regular duties, making administrative support and realistic workload allocation important. Periodic training should use practical files and case-based exercises rather than relying only on lectures about the statute.

5.3 Staff constraints and inadequate infrastructure

The speed and quality of a response are influenced by the resources available to the public authority. Staff shortages, outdated computers, unreliable connectivity, limited scanning facilities and the absence of dedicated record personnel can make it difficult to locate and reproduce documents. Requests involving several branches may require coordination that is not supported by clear internal procedures. Authorities should assess the volume and complexity of requests and provide suitable personnel, equipment and administrative assistance.

5.4 Weaknesses in record creation and preservation

An authority cannot disclose a record that it has not properly created, classified or retained. Section 4(1)(a) of the Act places duties on public authorities concerning the maintenance, cataloguing and indexing of records and their computerisation, where appropriate. In practice, inconsistent filing, incomplete registers, unclear retention practices and poorly indexed legacy files can obstruct retrieval. These weaknesses are especially consequential in areas such as land administration, public works, recruitment, welfare delivery and local development. A systematic records policy should cover creation, classification, retention, digitisation, backup and authorised retrieval.

5.5 Procedural barriers and appellate delays

The Act provides for a first appeal to the designated First Appellate Authority and a second appeal to the relevant Information Commission. Applicants may nevertheless find it difficult to identify the correct authority, understand the filing requirements or assemble supporting documents. At the Commission level, heavy caseloads, staffing constraints and vacancies can contribute to long waiting periods. The absence of a generally prescribed statutory deadline for final disposal of second appeals can add uncertainty. Clear instructions, accessible forms, electronic filing and transparent case-status information can make the appeal process easier to navigate.

5.6 Limited awareness among citizens

A legal right has limited practical reach when people do not know that it exists or are unsure how to use it. Awareness may be lower among people facing economic disadvantage, residents of remote areas and those with limited literacy or digital access. Section 26 of the Act provides for educational programmes to promote understanding of the right to information, with particular attention to disadvantaged communities. Public education should explain, in accessible language, how to submit an application, what information may be requested, applicable time limits and

available appeal routes. Educational institutions, local bodies, civil society organisations and media can contribute to this effort.

5.7 Capacity and functioning of Information Commissions

Information Commissions are central to the enforcement structure because they hear second appeals and complaints and exercise the powers assigned to them by the Act. Their ability to perform these functions depends on timely appointments, adequate supporting staff, functioning infrastructure and effective case-management arrangements. Vacancies and a growing backlog may delay hearings and reduce the practical value of the appeal remedy. Regular publication of data on pendency, disposal and compliance can help the public assess institutional performance.

5.8 Financial and administrative support

Statutory authority alone does not ensure operational effectiveness. Commissions require predictable budgets, competent staff, suitable hearing facilities and reliable information systems. Where basic resources are insufficient, case processing and communication with applicants may suffer. Budgetary planning and administrative arrangements should support the independent discharge of statutory functions while maintaining appropriate public accountability.

5.9 Implementation of Commission directions

The usefulness of an appeal decision depends in part on whether the public authority follows the direction issued. If ordered information is not supplied, an applicant may have to pursue further correspondence or proceedings. The Act contains penalty provisions under Section 20 in specified circumstances and provides for compensation in appropriate cases under Section 19(8)(b). Their application must follow the statutory requirements and the facts of each case. Authorities should assign responsibility for acting on Commission directions, record the steps taken and monitor completion.

5.10 Incomplete proactive disclosure

Section 4 requires public authorities to publish specified information on their own initiative so that citizens do not need to file an application for every routine matter. The practical value of this duty declines when websites contain outdated, incomplete or inaccessible material. Information should be organised under clear headings, updated at stated intervals and made available in formats that can be read by people using different devices and assistive technologies. Periodic transparency reviews can identify missing categories and improve compliance.

6. District Administration and the Implementation of RTI

District administration is a key point of contact between citizens and the state. Requests at this level may concern revenue records, land matters, policing, public health, education, social welfare, rural development, food distribution, municipal services and Panchayati Raj institutions. Citizens may also seek details about project expenditure, recruitment, pensions, scholarships and beneficiary selection. These subjects often involve more than one office, so the quality of implementation depends on coordination as well as the conduct of an individual PIO.

Where departmental records are not maintained consistently or officials are unfamiliar with the transfer and response procedures, applicants may receive delayed or fragmented information.

District offices can improve performance by adopting standard operating procedures, maintaining updated contact details of PIOs and appellate authorities, reviewing pending applications and organising periodic training. Stronger coordination between district departments, local bodies and state-level offices can also reduce unnecessary movement of applications.

7. The Right to Information (Amendment) Act, 2019: Institutional Implications

The Right to Information (Amendment) Act, 2019 changed provisions concerning the tenure, salaries, allowances and other terms and conditions of service of Information Commissioners. Under the amended framework, these matters are prescribed by the Central Government in accordance with the legislation and applicable rules. The changes have prompted debate about the institutional position and independence of Information Commissions. Since Commissions review decisions made by public authorities, public confidence depends on transparent appointments, fair service conditions, adequate resources and safeguards for impartial decision-making. This paper notes the institutional debate without treating any single view as conclusive.

8. Measures to Strengthen Implementation

8.1 Continuous capacity development

Training should be available to PIOs, Assistant PIOs, First Appellate Authorities and staff who search for or maintain records. It should cover statutory duties, exemptions, timelines, application transfers, appeal procedures and clear communication with applicants. Refresher sessions and practical case exercises can help translate legal knowledge into consistent office practice.

8.2 A reliable records-management framework

Each public authority should maintain a documented system for creating, classifying, indexing, storing, preserving and retrieving records. Digitisation should be supported by metadata, backup arrangements, access controls and retention policies. Technology should improve retrieval and preservation rather than merely convert disorganised paper files into disorganised digital files.

8.3 Better proactive publication

Authorities should review their Section 4 disclosures at regular intervals and publish required information in a clear and accessible form. Each office should identify responsibility for updating web pages and correcting omissions. Transparency audits can assess whether information is current, complete and understandable.

8.4 Strengthening Information Commissions

Vacancies should be addressed in a timely manner and Commissions should receive adequate staff, infrastructure and financial support. Case-management systems can assist with registration, scheduling, tracking of pending matters and communication of orders. Public reporting should make institutional performance easier to evaluate.

8.5 Public education and local-language guidance

Awareness initiatives should explain the practical steps involved in seeking information and pursuing an appeal. Materials in Hindi and other regional languages, community meetings, college-based programmes and accessible digital content can help reach people who are unfamiliar

with formal administrative procedures. Outreach should be designed around the information needs of local communities.

8.6 Monitoring compliance with orders

Public authorities should maintain a register of directions received from Information Commissions, identify the officer responsible for implementation and record when the required action is completed. Periodic internal review can identify recurring non-compliance and help ensure that directions are acted upon in accordance with law.

8.7 Appropriate use of digital systems

Online application facilities, searchable document repositories, electronic payment options and digital appeal tracking can reduce transaction costs and improve access. However, digital delivery must not exclude people who lack devices, connectivity or digital skills. Privacy and information security also require attention. Research on social media and digital mobilisation highlights the need to consider surveillance, privacy and freedom of expression alongside the opportunities offered by digital communication (Yadav & Kashyap, 2025).

8.8 Embedding transparency in administrative practice

Transparency should be treated as an ordinary responsibility of public administration. Department heads can reinforce this principle by supporting PIOs, encouraging accurate record creation and reviewing whether information is disclosed within the prescribed framework. A constructive institutional culture can reduce avoidable disputes and improve the quality of public service.

9. Discussion

The effectiveness of the RTI Act cannot be judged only by counting applications or orders. A more meaningful assessment asks whether the applicant received accurate and relevant information, whether it arrived within the applicable period and whether the response enabled the person to pursue a legitimate concern. This perspective draws attention to the links among public awareness, record quality, administrative capacity and institutional enforcement.

The challenges described above reinforce one another. Limited awareness may prevent people from filing applications; weak records may make it difficult for officials to respond; inadequate training may produce legally deficient decisions; and delays in appeals may reduce the practical value of the remedy. Conversely, proactive disclosure and better records can reduce the volume of individual requests, while trained officials and effective case management can improve the handling of more complex matters. Studies concerning self-help groups and community participation also suggest that access to knowledge can support collective engagement, while digital communication research raises questions about rights and safeguards in online environments (Mishra & Kashyap, 2024; Mishra & Kashyap, 2026; Yadav & Kashyap, 2025).

The RTI framework should therefore be understood as a continuing governance process rather than a document-supply counter. Its wider purpose is supported when public decisions are properly recorded, routine information is disclosed proactively, and citizens can seek review when an authority fails to meet its obligations. Reforms are likely to be more effective when administrative, technological and public-awareness measures are planned together.

10. Conclusion

The Right to Information Act, 2005 provides an important statutory foundation for transparency, accountability and citizen participation in India. It gives citizens a formal means of seeking information about public decisions, administrative procedures and the use of public resources. The practical reach of this right, however, depends on the capacity and conduct of the institutions responsible for implementing it.

Administrative reluctance, insufficient training, staff and infrastructure constraints, weak records, limited awareness, appellate delays and poor follow-through on Commission directions can all restrict access. These are not isolated problems: weaknesses in one part of the system can increase pressure on the others. At district level, where citizens commonly seek information about essential services and local development, coordination and reliable documentation are particularly important.

A stronger implementation framework requires trained personnel, well-maintained records, meaningful proactive disclosure, accessible appeal procedures, adequately supported Information Commissions and sustained public education. Digital systems can assist, provided that they remain inclusive and protect privacy. Ultimately, the success of the Act should be assessed by whether citizens can obtain usable information and employ it to participate in public affairs. A responsive information system can strengthen trust in public institutions and contribute to more accountable democratic governance.

References

Government of India. (2005). The Right to Information Act, 2005. New Delhi: Government of India.

Mishra, P., & Kashyap, A. K. (2024). A study of self-help group-led women empowerment. *The Opinion,* July–December 2024.

Mishra, P., & Kashyap, A. K. (2026). The impact of self-help group on decision-making power among rural women. *Journal of Socio-Educational & Cultural Research*, Srijan Research Foundation, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh.

Yadav, K., & Kashyap, A. K. (2025). Social media: A weapon of surveillance and mass mobilization. *Nav Jyoti*, July–December 2025, 1–8.

Gupta, J., & Pandey, D. K. (2026). Role of self-help groups in women empowerment. *The Opinion*, 15(28). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23135727

Mishra, P., & Kashyap, A. K. (2026). Women's empowerment: A multidimensional approach to gender equality and sustainable development. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research* Technology, 11(8), 1819–1825. https://doi.or/10.38124/ijisrt/26aug888

Government of India. (2005). Right to Information Rules, 2005, as applicable and subsequently amended.

Government of India, Department of Personnel and Training. Official materials and guidelines concerning the implementation of the Right to Information Act. Available through the Department's official website.

Second Administrative Reforms Commission. (2006). Right to Information: Master Key to Good Governance. Second Report. Government of India.

Government of India. (2019). The Right to Information (Amendment) Act, 2019.

Central Information Commission. Annual reports and official materials concerning the implementation of the Right to Information Act.

State Information Commissions. Annual reports and official materials concerning the implementation of the Right to Information Act.