

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

2nd Floor, August Kranti Bhawan,
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066

Decision No. CIC/SB/A/2015/000211

Dated 09.11.2016

Appellant : Shri Anilkumar Tukaram Gaikwad,
Plot No. 79, Saketnagar,
Bhaushingpura,
Aurangabad-431002.

Respondent : Central Public Information Officer,
O/o Principal Commissioner of Central
Excise, Mumbai-I, 3rd Floor,
New Central Excise Building,
115, M.K. Road, Churchgate,
Mumbai-400020.

Date of Hearing : 09.11.2016

Relevant dates emerging from the appeal:

RTI application filed on : 05.12.2014
CPIO's reply : 30.12.2014
First appeal filed on : 03 .02.2015
FAA's Order : 25.02.2015
Second appeal filed on : 04.08.2015

ORDER

1. Shri Anil Kumar Tukaram Gaikwad filed an application dated 05.12.2014 under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) before the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO), O/o Commissioner, Central Excise, Mumbai-I seeking information on four points pertaining to fixation of seniority of Superintendent, Central Excise (Mumbai Zone) with reference to OM No. 20011/1/2001-Estt. (D) dated 21.01.2002 issued by the DOPT.

2. The appellant filed a second appeal dated 04.08.2015 before the Commission on the grounds that he has not been provided correct

information and requested the Commission to direct the CPIO and the First Appellate Authority (FAA), Central Excise, Mumbai-I to provide information regarding fixation of seniority since the administration is using administrative diplomacy to deprive them of their legitimate rights.

Hearing:

3. The appellant Shri Anil Kumar Tukaram Gaikwad was not present despite notice. The respondent Shri Robin Gupta, CPIO, O/o Commissioner, Central Excise attended the hearing through video conferencing.

4. The respondent submitted that information as per available records has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 30.12.2014. The respondent further submitted that the FAA vide his order dated 25.02.2015 upheld the reply of the CPIO and provided further details regarding the information sought for to the appellant.

Decision:

5. The Commission, after hearing the submissions of the respondent and perusing the records, observes that due information as per available records has been provided to the appellant by the respondent. Hence, no further action is required in the matter.

6. With the above observations, the appeal is disposed of.

7. Copy of the decision be provided free of cost to the parties.

(Sudhir Bhargava)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(V.K. Sharma)
Designated Officer