

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

Decision No. CIC/SB/A/2015/000469

Dated 30.11.2016

Appellant : ShriVijay Kumar,
S/o Shri Jai Pal,
VPO Baland, Distt-Rohtak,
Haryana-124 029.

Respondent : Central Public Information Officer,
Directorate General of Central Excise
Intelligence, West Block-VIII, Ward No.6,
2nd Floor, R.K. Puram, New Delhi – 110 066.

Date of Hearing : 30.11.2016

Relevant dates emerging from the appeal:

RTI application filed on : 16.02.2015

CPIO's reply : 27.02.2015

First appeal filed on : 30.03.2015

FAA's order : 21.04.2015

Second appeal filed on : 02.06.2015

ORDER

1. Shri Vijay Kumar filed an application dated 16.02.2015 under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) before the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO), Directorate General of Central Excise Intelligence (DGCEI) seeking information on five points pertaining to action taken in Case No. G-I-567/2013

of M/s Super Well Services and M/s Super Well Services Private Limited Company.

2. The appellant filed a second appeal dated 02.06.2015 before the Commission on the grounds that he has not been provided information on point nos. 4 and 5 of the RTI application.

Hearing:

3. The appellant Shri Vijay Kumar was not present despite notice. The respondent Shri Pradeep Rathi, Intelligence Officer, DGCEI was present in person.

4. The respondent submitted that a point wise reply was provided to the appellant vide letter dated 27.02.2015. The respondent further submitted that the appellant was informed in respect of point no. 1 of the RTI application that the case against M/S Super Well Services has been closed, while the case against M/s Super Well Services Pvt. Ltd. is pending adjudication and has not gone through all the stages of adjudication, appeals and revisions. The respondent also stated that the information sought in point nos. 4 and 5 of the RTI application is in the nature of queries and hence, does not fall under the definition of 'Information' as per Section 2(f) of the RTI Act.

Decision:

5. The Commission, after hearing the submissions of the respondent and perusing the records, agrees with the reply of the CPIO and the order of the FAA dated 21.04.2015. Thus, the Commission finds no grounds to interfere with the order of the FAA. Hence, no further intervention on part of the Commission 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