

**The Right to Information Act in Bangladesh:
An Analysis in the Light of Johannesburg Principles
of Freedom of Information Legislation**

Mohammad Hasan Murad*
Kazi Arshadul Hoque**

***Abstract:** Today's knowledge based world is now resonating with the call for meaningful democracy backed by transparency and accountability in the state engine and people's right of access to information has gained a great importance. In a modern democratic state, the right to information, more popularly described as the 'right to know,' is an indispensable prerequisite. There is no denying the fact that the notion of freedom of thought, of conscience, of speech and rule of law become worthless if the people are deprived of access to information. . There appears to have been a universal recognition of the demand and necessity for the establishment of people's right of access to information. The experience in other countries suggests that this scenario can be changed by empowering people with right to information or freedom of information. The translation of right to information into law has to be done considering a number of principles which are required to be addressed in the law. The article presents an overview of the concept of right to information and attempts to discuss the principles underpinning right to information along with an analysis of to what extent those principles are reflected in the right to information law of Bangladesh.*

Introduction

Right to information, often otherwise known as freedom of information is now a universally recognized right and considered a fundamental key to the all the other rights. The United Nation in its first session of general assembly adopted the Regulation (59)1 which

* Assistant Professor, Department of Law, International Islamic University Chittagong

** Lecturer, Department of Law, International Islamic University Chittagong

declares “Freedom of information is a fundamental human right and is the touchstone of all the freedoms to which the United Nations is concerned”.ⁱIn a democratic society people are the most powerful element and right to information empowers them to realize the fruits of democracy. Transparent governance structure is an absolute requirement for free debate and accountability that encourage citizens to engage with public officials and make the state a more effective one. Governments cannot be transparent without creating regime where general people have a right to know what their Government is doing or what information it is holding. Adams ⁱⁱ puts emphasis that it is indispensable that the people acquire knowledge in order to participate in politics. “The people have a right, an indisputable, inalienable, indefeasible divine right to that most dreaded and envied kind of knowledge, I mean of the characters and conduct of their rulers,” stated Adams. He continued “The preservation of the means of knowledge among the lowest ranks, is of more importance than all the property of all the rich men in the country.”

Freedom of information is important because of-

1. Confidence and loyalty thrive where people have the right to know.
2. Patriotism springs from the people’s own convictions, based not upon government propaganda but on full information of all sides of every question.
3. Government power, backed by an informed citizenry, is unassailable, because through full availability to the news, an equal partnership between the government and the individual is established, based upon respect for the latter’s right to know.ⁱⁱⁱ

Meaning of Right to information

Right to information is also known as freedom of information or access to information. Some people call this right as Right to know as well. In this article these terms are often used interchangeably. Buisnessdictionary.com provides the simplest definition of this right-

“Right of a citizen to be informed in writing if a governmental agency holds certain information and to request its disclosure. If refused, he or she can demand to be given the cause of refusal in writing”.^{iv}

Resolution 59 (1) ^v which was adopted in the first session of United Nations' General Assembly defines freedom of information in general term as follows-

“Freedom of information implies the right to gather, transmit and publish news anywhere and everywhere without fetters. As such it is an essential factor in any serious effort to promote the peace and progress of the world.”

The two most respected documents of Human Rights recognize the right to information.

Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights^{vi}, 1948 reads:

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers”

Article 19 (2) of the International Covenant On Civil and Political Rights(ICCPR)^{vii}, 1966 states:

“Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice”.

The foregoing definitions not only encompass the right to know to a national level but it also include the duty of the states to the citizens of the world to inform them what is crucial for the world peace and prosperity.

In the light of above definitions we can define Right to Information as a right ensured by legislation which guarantees access to information held by the Government. However the Right to Know must be exercised by the legal process established by the related legislation. An information request for Government held information should be processed in minimum time with free of cost or at minimal cost. An information request will not be denied unless the information sought

falls within the scope of the exceptions specified by the legislation and written reasons for such denial are provided to the seeker of information.

Origin and Development of the concept

The rise of the RTI law worldwide comes as an indicator of the increasing acknowledgment of the importance of the citizens' access to information as a catalyst for strengthening democracy, promoting human rights and good governance, and fighting corruption.

The history of emergence of the Right to Information is not very new. Constitution of many countries explicitly or impliedly guarantees Freedom of Information but such guaranty was not often enough for the citizens to obtain information from the Government agencies which tend to be secretive. Under different constitutions presidents and prime ministers obtained great powers and authority which were supposed to be checked by administrative accountability. Various field of development called for greater openness and accountability which set the stage of Introduction of Freedom of Information legislations. With the growth of modern welfare state, governments began to affect more people, and they demanded more information from the government. Issues concerning citizen's rights and entitlements sparked public debate. Then, starting in the early 1960s protest movement encouraged greater "power to the people". As the 1960s progressed, people grew increasingly skeptical of official information and credibility gaps emerged in democratic societies. At the same time, increased executive power shifted the focus of lobbyist from the legislature to the executive, and pressure groups demanded more information from the incumbent administrations and governments... civil servants also started to support FOIs (freedom of information) as whistleblowers increasingly faced with the prospects of prosecution. Last but not the least, the disciplines of political science and public administration grew, and the scholars in those fields joined the chorus of calls for more information in the government.^{viii}

Sweden enjoyed the privilege of being the first country in the world to introduce its Freedom of Information law namely "Freedom of Press Act 1866". The principle of openness "Offentlighetsgrundsatsen" has been long protected in Swedish law. There are four fundamental laws that make up the Swedish Constitution. Of those, the Instrument of Government and the Freedom of the Press Act specifically provide for freedom of information.

Chapter 2, Article 1 of The Instrument of Government guarantees that all citizens have the right of Freedom of information: that is, the freedom to procure and receive information and otherwise acquaint oneself with the utterances of others.

Specific rules on access are contained in the Freedom of the Press Act, which was first adopted in 1766. The current version was adopted in 1949 and amended in 1976. Chapter 2 on the Public Nature of Official Documents, decrees that "every Swedish subject [and resident] shall have free access to official documents." Public authorities must respond immediately to requests for official documents. Requests can be in any form and can be anonymous.

Each authority is required to keep a register of all official documents and most indices are publicly available. This makes it possible for ordinary citizens to go to the Prime Minister's office and view copies of all of his correspondence.^{ix}

In the United States, steps are taken to legislate Freedom of Information following a conference by the United Nations held in 1948. Congress debated the relevance and necessity of Freedom of Information Act for almost a decade before it is enacted. The US FOIA , which amended the Administrative Procedure Act 1946, passed on July 4,1966 and went into effect in 1967. For the first time in US, individuals and organizations could request documents from a federal agency, although some documents fall into nine broad exemption categories and remain off limit. Amendments made to the FOIA in 1984 in the wake of Watergate scandal significantly strengthen the reach of FOI. Unfortunately, subsequent amendments during Regan administration and other legislation passed after 9/11 attack have greatly restricted the scope of the act^x. However the US FOIA has served as a model of most Freedom of Information or Right to Information legislation of the world.

Over the past years there is a wave of Freedom of Information legislation in developed and developing countries. Almost 85 countries of the world have adopted some form of Right to Information legislation. The number is expected to increase in future as many other countries have their Freedom of Information Act is in pipe line. The increased recognition of this right indicates that the governments are willing to be more transparent and the era of secrecy is going to end. Developing countries view Right to Information as a great opportunity

to fight corruption and promote good governance which are the key to development and prosperity.

Right to Information and state secrecy

There is a general pattern in Freedom of Information legislation to provide exemption for information concerning national security. In many countries there are different Official Secrecy Acts which put limitation on what kind of information may be released or what kind of data may be withheld. In theory, the sole purpose of these Acts is to ensure national security and smooth functioning of governance. In reality, these cloaks of secrecy acts are often used to hide abuses and corruption, for instance undue interference in the political system and the information relating to torture on opposing political parties by police and intelligence agencies. These acts coupled with the different surveillance regulation can create a Panopticon^{xi} regime which might only be balanced by an effective FOI. Justice Potter Stewart said in the Pentagon Papers case^{xii}, “When everything is classified, then nothing is classified, and the system becomes one to be disregarded by the cynical or the careless, and to be manipulated by those intent on self-protection or self-promotion.” he continued, “the hallmark of a truly effective internal security system would be the maximum possible disclosure, recognizing that secrecy can best be preserved only when credibility is truly maintained.”

Right to Information Act 2009 (Bangladesh)

Bangladesh gained her independence in 1971 after a bloody war. There was much hope and aspiration that the post war Bangladesh will be a better place to live and the country would prosper economically and socially. Unfortunately the expectation remained farfetched due to very bad governance and power games of the political leaders and power hungry army men. The democratic process has not been smooth all these years since independence. Bangladesh is submerged in deep corruption due to lack of transparency and accountability of those who are in authority. A revolutionary change in the governance is the only way out of the problems and to setting a course towards meaningful development. The enactment of Right to Information Act 2009 is a great step towards a success.

In the preamble of the Constitution of Bangladesh it is pledged that “it shall be a fundamental aim of the State to realize through the democratic process a socialist society, free from exploitation a society in which the rule of law, fundamental human rights and freedom,

equality and justice, political, economic and social, will be secured for all citizens^{xiii}.”It is absolutely compulsory that this pledge should be reflected through *inter alia* freedom of information legislation. The Constitution also guarantees freedom of speech and of expression in unequivocal terms. Article 39^{xiv} reads

1. Freedom of thought and conscience is guaranteed.
2. Subject to any reasonable restrictions imposed by law in the interests of the security of the State, friendly relations with foreign states, public order, decency or morality, or in relation to contempt of court, defamation or incitement to an offence—
(a) the right of every citizen to freedom of speech and expression, and (b) freedom of press are guaranteed.”

Universal Declaration of Human Rights and The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights made it mandatory to the state parties that they enact suitable legislation to empower people with Freedom of expression which includes right to seek, receive and impart all kinds of information except those are necessary for state security and securing privacy of ordinary citizens. Bangladesh became signatory to The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights on December 6, 2000. So Bangladesh is bound by international law to enact laws which will ensure greater freedom and access to its citizens and stakeholders and adopt policies to be more transparent and accountable.

Before the enactment of Right to Information Act 2009, there was no specific law or regulation which provides citizens to seek information from government or non government organizations. On the other hand there have been some prohibitory laws in order to ensure secrecy. Some notable are as follows-

1. Section 5 (1) of the Official Secrets Act, 1923 which intends to secure some very confidential information like passwords, the release of which can harm the concerned authority or project. Nevertheless, this section has been widely used as an excuse to withhold information even though their release in no way could have been harmful.
2. Section 123 of the Evidence Act -this section gives wide power to the head of department to decide whether a piece of unpublished information relating to state matters which could be used as

evidence in the court should be released or not. He has got absolute discretion on the release and it is not compulsory that his decision should be based on any reasonable grounds and it is not also mandatory to provide the reasons for information rejection. Only subjective satisfaction is required in this case.

3. Rule 28(1) of the Rules of Business 2009 prohibits publication of official matters.
4. Rule 19 of the Government Servants (Conduct) Rules, 1979 sets up disclosure liabilities to the government officers.

There are many other provisions scattered in different laws and rules prohibiting access to information. Information generally remains secret if not stated or classified otherwise. Although disclosures(should) be the general rule, not the exception; that all individuals have equal rights of access; that the burden be on the Government to justify the withholding of a document, not on the person who requests it^{xv}.

Upon the demands of civil society and journalist communities, the Law Commission of Bangladesh prepared a draft paper on RTI in 2002. However, this working paper was prepared without proper consultation of people and stakeholders and later the process was blocked in the bureaucratic red tape. For some years the whereabouts of the paper were even unknown.

In 2005 Manusher Jonno Foundation (MJF) which represents an association of non-governmental organizations, took the initiative to revive the RTI legislative effort. The organization invited the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative (CHRI) to provide technical assistance in terms of capacity building, awareness rising, and creating better understanding of the benefits of RTI^{xvi}.

In the mean time, the demand for RTI was intensified by different groups such as media, research groups, academia, NGOs, etc. A process of promotion started through developing various communications materials, popular theatre, and songs on RTI, and conducting of research. Many non-governmental organizations and other networks become keenly involved in this process^{xvii}.

In 2007 the change in the political scenario in Bangladesh actually helped speed up the enactment process of RTIA. The transitional government was keen to improve governance and the law was drafted,

reviewed and critiqued by experts and submitted to the Information Ministry in 2007. The Ministry finalized the draft and finally signed it as an ordinance by the president in October 2008. According to the Constitution the ordinance has to be ratified by the next elected parliament.

A general election was held in December 2008. The RTI Forum^{xviii} lobbied with the members of new parliament for the enactment of the RTI law. The law minister, information minister, and several MP's were met individually to promote its enactment. The newly elected government has set up a review committee of experts to evaluate the ordinance passed during the time of caretaker government. The RTI Forum also lobbied with the expert group in order to expedite the rectification of the ordinance.^{xix}

Finally, on March 29, the bill was enacted in parliament as Right to Information Act (RTI), 2009 ushering Bangladesh into the new challenge of implementing the law.

Johannesburg Principles of Right to Information legislation and analysis of RTI Act

Article 19, an International Human Rights Organization and Centre for Applied Legal Studies (CALS) at the University of Witwatersrand, South Africa, jointly convened a meeting of some 36 leading experts from different parts of the world in Johannesburg, South Africa on Freedom of Expression In 1995. Their aim was to set authoritative standards and the legitimate scope of restrictions on freedom of expression in protecting national security^{xx}. The group of experts discussed, debated and developed principles on Freedom of Expression and Information which was released in 1996 in the name of *The Johannesburg Principles: National Security, Freedom of Expression and Access to Information*^{xxi}. These principles received wide recognition from judges, lawyers, civil society actors, academics, journalists around the world. The principles were also endorsed by the UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Expression^{xxii}. In 1999 Article 19 published a set of detailed general standard and process clarifying the principles relating to Freedom of Information in Johannesburg document in the name *The Public's Right to Know, Principles on Freedom of Information Legislation*^{xxiii}. We will discuss the principles in brief in the following.

Principle 1: Maximum disclosure

Freedom of information legislation should be guided by the principle of maximum disclosure. This principle establishes a legal presumption that all information held by public bodies is subject to disclosure and this presumption may be rebutted only in minimum circumstances. It embodies the core concept of Freedom of information and right to know and should always be given the best priority. Everybody in the state should have access to this right and should not require the information seeker to demonstrate specific interest in the information sought.

The above principle is reflected in Section 4 of Right to Information Act, 2009, which spells out in clear terms a statutory right to information for every citizen. The sections runs as, ' Subject to the provisions of this Act, every citizen has a right to information from the Authority and the Authority shall on demand from a citizen be bound to provide information'.

Principle 2: Obligation to publish

Public bodies are under obligation to publish key information. Public bodies should not only respond to information request but also make available for general people certain important information relating to their function, activities, finance and service they provide. The law must establish both a general obligation to publish and main categories of information that must be published. This makes it convenient for the members of the public to obtain service from the related bodies.

Section 6 of the Act lays down the obligation for public authorities to publish certain information from time to time. They may be summarized as follows-

- a. A description of the organization and responsibilities of the executives of the public authority and description of its decision making process and responsibilities of its officers and employees.
- b. Classes of records in the possession of the Public Authority including the rules, regulations, instructions and list of manuals used by its employees.
- c. A statement about the conditions upon which citizens can acquire any license, permit, grant, allotment, consent, approval

or other benefits of any nature from the Public Authority or upon which transactions or contracts of any category can be entered with the Public Authority.

- d. Name, designation and location of the officer to whom information request should be made.

It is also stated that the above information will be made available to the public for inspection free of cost and be supplied the copy with nominal fees. In order to fulfill the requirement of this section, authorities may establish websites to publish their information also provide information kiosks in their premises to supply this general information. Although website establishment is not clearly indicated in the section but the objective is better achieved with the setting up of interactive websites where people can view, search and download latest updates from the organization and it has shown very fruitful so far. It is also important that such websites are regularly updated.

Principle 3: Promotion of open government

Public bodies must actively promote open governance. Public bodies must inform the people of their rights and a culture of openness must be promoted inside the government. Reluctant officials can seriously undermine the working of even most advance right to information legislation. The law should require that proper resources and attention are deployed to promote openness. General people should be educated and made aware of their rights and ways to realize them through mass media and such other methods. The law should also provide ways to deal with official secrecy.

There is no specific section as to the openness of the government in the Act. However, penalties have been imposed in case of the failure of disclosing information or failure to give reasons for non disclosure or delay.

Principle 4: Limited scope of exceptions

Exceptions should be clearly and narrowly drawn and subject to strict “harm” and “public interest” tests. All requests for information should be dealt with individually unless the public body can show the requested information falls within the narrow categories of exceptions. The law should provide a complete list of the legitimate aims in order to justify non disclosure of information. A three part test must be done before any information denial.

- a. The information must be within the scope of legitimate aims listed in the law.
- b. Disclosure of such information must cause a threat of substantial harm to that aim.
- c. The harm to the aim must be greater than the interest of the public in having the information.

Section 7 points out the circumstances in which information may be withheld by the authorities. The authorities shall not be obliged to provide following information-

- a. Information which pose threat to the security, integrity and sovereignty of Bangladesh.
- b. Any information relating to any foreign policy matter as may offend the existing relationship with any foreign country or international organization or any regional bloc or organization.
- c. Secret information received from a foreign government.
- d. Publication of any information relating to inherent secrets of commercial or business nature, copyright or intellectual property publication of which may harm the intellectual property right of a third party.
- e. Disclosure of any of the following information which may be gainful or damaging to any particular individual or organization, such as:-
 - i. any advance information about income tax, customs, VAT and law relating to narcotics, about budget or change in the tax rate;
 - ii. any advance information about changes related to exchange rate and interest rate;
 - iii. any advance information about the management and supervision.
- f. Disclosure of any such information as may obstruct the enforcement of law or may incite any offence.
- g. Information, the disclosure of which would endanger the security of public or impede the due judicial process of a pending case.

- h. Information, the disclosure of which would offend the privacy of the personal life of an individual.
- i. Information, the disclosure of which would endanger the life or physical safety of any person.
- j. Information given in confidence to law enforcement organization by a person.
- k. Any matter pending in any court of law and which has been expressly forbidden to be published by any court of law or tribunal or the disclosure of which may constitute contempt of court.
- l. Information which would impede the process of investigation.
- m. Any information which would affect any criminal investigation process and arrest or prosecution of offenders.
- n. Any such information which, according to law, is liable to be published only for a certain period of time.
- o. Information obtained through technical or scientific experiment, which it is expedient to keep secret for strategic or commercial reasons.
- p. Any information pertaining to a purchase process before it is complete or a decision has been taken about it;
 - i. such information as may be prejudicial to the special rights of the National Parliament;
 - ii. any secret information of a person which is guarded by law;
 - iii. advance information relating to question papers of an examination or marks obtained;
 - iv. documents including summaries to be placed before the Cabinet, or as the case may be, Council of Advisers and information relating to discussions and decisions of such meetings:

Provided that the decisions of Cabinet or Council of Advisors, as the case may be, reasons thereof, and the material basis upon which the decisions were taken, may be made public.

It seems that the above list tries to cover state security, price sensitive information, and personal privacy and sub-judice matters. Many observers believe that the exception is too broad and susceptible to be misused as an excuse for non disclosure by the authorities unless a clear explanation is provided by the authority in relation to applying these exceptions on information requests.

Principle 5: Processes to facilitate access

Requests for information should be processed rapidly and fairly and an independent review of any refusals should be available. A process of information request decision should be dealt in three levels: within the public body; appeals to an independent administrative body and appeals to a court.

According to Section 24 of the Act any person who does not receive a decision within the time specified in the Act or is aggrieved by a decision of the officer in-charge may prefer an appeal to the Head of the concerned authority within 30 days of time expiry or receipt of impugned decision. The appellate authority may accept a late application if there is sufficient cause for such delay. The appellate authority will direct the officer in-charge to supply the information or discharge the appeal application within fifteen days of the receipt of the appeal.

Section 25 tells us the procedure for complaints to the Information Commission. A person may lodge a complaint if he does not receive information^{xxiv}, aggrieved by the decision of the appeal, or does not get information within the time or any other matters concerning supply of information.

Section 29 says ‘no court shall entertain any suit, application or other proceeding in respect of any order made under this Ordinance and no such order shall be called in question otherwise than by way of an appeal under this Ordinance’. A person aggrieved by the decision of information officer or Information Commission cannot go to the court. This provision has been criticized by Right to Information Activities. In my opinion this provision is against the spirit of Right to Information.

Principle 6: Costs for obtaining access to information

Individuals should not be deterred from making information request by the excessive costs. The cost for obtaining access to information should not be so high as to discourage the general people for making request.

Section 9 lays down the procedure for providing information including costs. The officer in-charge will let the applicant know about the cost of information sought and the cost should not exceed the actual cost for retrieving and printing or otherwise supplying through electronic ways.

Principle 7: Open meetings

Meetings of public body should be open to public. People should know what their government is doing and they should have a way to participate in the decision making process. There a presumption should be established that all government meetings are open to public unless there is a compelling reason not to be so. A meeting in this context is referred as formal meetings.

There are no such provisions in the act as to open meetings. Open formal meetings are very crucial. They provide people a chance to witness what is going on in a organization and to what extent such organization is serving to the public.

Principle 8: Disclosure takes precedence

Laws which are inconsistent with the principle of maximum disclosure should be amended or repealed. The right to information law requires that all the other laws should be interpreted in such way as to be consistent with its provisions so far as possible. In cases where this is not possible, other legislation dealing with information should be subject to the principles underlying the freedom of information legislation.

As we have seen earlier there are many secrecy laws that can deter free flow of information and some of which are so ambiguous as to have potentials to create barrier to any kind of information request. Unless RTI is given the priority over secrecy, the objects of the Act could not be realized. The Act has not outlined any specific provision as to the circumstances where the RTI will get privilege.

Earlier in this article, it is discussed the myriad of secrecy regulations of the country. It is quite understandable that there will be potential conflict between secrecy provisions and RTI obligations. From the

general reading of the Act , It is obvious that the law makers intended to make right to information as a general rule, nevertheless, the intention may be defeated as the host of exceptions within the law and previous secrecy legislation will stand on the way of free flow of information if the law does not say anything about which law takes precedence. Section 3 (b) gives the Act precedence over any other Act coming in conflict with the RTI ACT. However, the exceptions laid down in the Act are two broad and could be applied to any information request resulting in the denial as such. The Government should make specific guidelines as to the scope and extent of the application of those exceptions.

Principle 9: Protection for whistleblower

Individuals who release information on wrongdoing or whistleblower must be protected. Persons should be protected from any legal, administrative or employment related sanctions for releasing information on wrongdoing. In this context wrongdoing may include but not limited to criminal activities, failure to comply legal obligation, mischief, miscarriage of justice, corruption, dishonesty and nepotism. The RTI law should have lent such protections to the people who reveal in order to encourage openness and accountability. Many people in the administration who come across corruption and mal administration will spontaneously come up and reveal the wrong doers if we the government guarantees their security and protection from the retaliation of the persons whose wrong doing were exposed.

Conclusion

Enactment of a right to Information law is a significant event in the judicial history of Bangladesh. There is no doubt that merely enacting law is not adequate to change the present secretive and conservative government. In order to bring real change the law must be implemented effectively. But it is not an easy task for a developing country like Bangladesh. We have the experience that a lot of good laws prevail in our country but in reality people are not getting the fruit of these laws properly. One of the biggest obstacles to implementation of RTI is the wide spread corruption in each and every sector of the country. In addition, the Parliament of Bangladesh is not functioning properly to safeguard the interest of the people. It is true that at present the Government does not have the infrastructure and system to fully realize the potential of the Act. Digital divide and lack of Information technology support exists which is seriously undermining facilitation of required infrastructure for implementing the Right to Information Act.

Moreover, that mass people is not educated and conscious enough. Attempt to promote RTI in Bangladesh has been reflected in various advertisement regarding RTI on electronic and print media by which people at least are being informed of this Act. However, it will take time and considerable effort to get over with the long lasting secrecy mentality and practice of the Government Officials.

References

- i <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/1/ares1.htm> accessed on December 1, 2009.
- ii John Adams, “*A Dissertation on the Canon and Feudal Law*,” Boston Gazette, September 30, 1765, in Papers of John Adams, ed. Robert J. Taylor et al., vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1977), p 108.
- iii Foerstel, Herbert N.. Freedom of Information & the Right to Know : The Origins & Applications of the Freedom of Information Act. Westport, CT, USA: Greenwood Publishing Group, Incorporated, 1999. p 24.
- iv <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/freedom-of-information.html> accessed on December 24, 2009
- v Supra note 1.
- vi <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/> accessed on December 4,2009.
- vii <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/ccpr.htm> accessed on December 4,2009
- viii Sykes, P. and Piotrowski, S. "Executive Authority, Government Transparency, and Democratic Accountability: Freedom of Information in Anglo-American Systems" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Hilton Chicago and the Palmer House Hilton, Chicago, IL Online . p 7 available at http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p60360_index.html accessed on December 20, 2009.
- ix <http://www.freedominfo.org/countries/sweden.htm> accessed on December 21, 2009.
- x Supra note 8 page 9.

- xi The **Panopticon** is a type of prison building designed by English philosopher and social theorist Jeremy Bentham in 1785. The concept of the design is to allow an observer to observe all prisoners without the prisoners being able to tell whether they are being watched. This is often referred to a society where authorities are increasing surveillance.
- xii New York Times Company v. United States, 403 U.S. 713, 729 (1971).
- xiii http://bdlaws.gov.bd/pdf_part.php?id=367 accessed on January 3, 2010.
- xiv Id.
- xv Foerstel, Herbert N.. *Freedom of Information & the Right to Know : The Origins & Applications of the Freedom of Information Act*. Westport, CT, USA: Greenwood Publishing Group, Incorporated, 1999. p 51
- xvi Anam , Shaheen, Freedom to know, Forum 2009, the Daily Star, available in <http://www.thedailystar.net/forum/2009/june/freedom.htm> accessed on January 5, 2010.
- xvii id.
- xviii Coalition of 80 organisations and individuals to promote RTI. For more information visit http://www.manusher.org/rti_conference/RTI_Forum_Members_Name_and_Address.pdf.
- xix Anam ,Shaheen ,Supra note 16.
- xx Mendel, Toby, *The Johannesburg Principles: Overview and Implementation, ARTICLE 19*, Global Campaign for Free Expression retrieved from <http://www.article19.org/pdfs/publications/jo-burg-principles-overview.pdf> accessed on December 12, 2009
- xxi Available on <http://www.article19.org/pdfs/standards/joburgprinciples.pdf>
- xxii Supra note 16.
- xxiii Available on <http://www.article19.org/pdfs/standards/righttoknow.pdf>.
- xxiv Section 13 (1) of RTI Act, 2009.