

Central Information Commission, New Delhi  
File No. CIC/SH/A/2016/000007  
File No. CIC/SH/A/2016/000003  
File No. CIC/SH/A/2016/000008  
Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (19)

Date of hearing : 10th February 2017  
Date of decision : 10th February 2017  
Name of the Appellant : SHRI VISHAL SUBHASH PAWAR  
C/O. DR. PAWAR, YASHWANT  
APARTMENTS, SAILANI BABA STOP,  
JAIL ROAD, NASHIK ROAD,  
NASHIK, MAHARASHTRA-422101  
Name of the Public Authority/Respondent : CENTRAL PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER,  
HINDUSTAN PETROLEUM CORPORATION  
LIMITED  
AURANGABAD LPG REGIONAL  
OFFICE H-1, M.I.D.C.,  
CHIKALTHANA, AURANGABAD,  
MAHARASHTRA- 431 006

CENTRAL PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER,  
HINDUSTAN PETROLEUM CORPORATION  
LIMITED  
VASHI RETAIL REGIONAL OFFICE:  
D-500, T. T. C. INDUSTRIAL  
AREA, VASHI, NAVI MUMBAI-400705

The Appellant was present at the NIC Studio, Nasik.

On behalf of the Respondents, the following were present:-

1. Shri Sujit Kumar Roy, Chief RM was present at the NIC Studio, Aurangabad.
2. Shri H. Raje, Senior Manager was present at the NIC Studio, Mumbai.

Information Commissioner : Shri Sharat Sabharwal

These files contain appeals in respect of the RTI applications dated 18.3.2015 (two applications) and 10.3.2015, filed by the Appellant, seeking information

concerning certain retail outlets. Not satisfied with the response of the Respondents, he has approached the CIC in second appeal in all the three cases.

2. With regard to the RTI application dated 18.3.2015 (File No.7), with four points regarding Bapu Gas Agency, the Appellant stated that the name of operator of the gas agency has not been provided in response to point No. 2. Further, information concerning the documents of availability of premises provided for selection of the operator of the dealership (point No. 3) has also not been provided. The information sought at point No. 4 regarding the agreement between the dealer and the shop owner, where the dealership is located, has also not been given. The Respondents drew our attention to the CPIO's reply dated 22.5.2015 in which it was stated that Smt. Surekha Anand Solnaki was the distributor and she was the only person operating the distributorship. In view of this, no further action is due on point No. 2. With regard to point No. 3, the CPIO should provide copies of the documents, if any, provided by the dealer for availability of premises at the time of selection for the dealership /its shifting, with the exception of the documents establishing the ownership of the premises, which is the personal information of the owner. As for point No. 4, we see no ground to disclose to the Appellant the information concerning the lease agreement between the dealer and a third party.

3. In regard to the RTI application dated 18.3.2015 (File No. 3), the Appellant stated that he was not satisfied with the information provided on all its points, with the exception of point No. 2. Regarding point No. 1, he wanted the name of the operator of the agency. The Respondents stated that they have provided the

information as per the dealership agreement and have no further information to provide. In view of this, we note that no further action is due on point No. 1. At point No. 3, the Appellant has sought information regarding the bank in which the retail outlet is maintaining its account. We see no ground for disclosure of this information to him. The information sought at point No. 4 is regarding the identity of the person and his mobile number, who booked tankers on behalf of the agency. The Respondents stated that these bookings can be made through their portal and on phone by a representative of the agency and they do not have such information in their record. Therefore, in our view, no further action is due on this point also. The CPIO is directed to provide the information sought at points No. 5 and 6 of the RTI application.

4. In respect of the RTI application dated 10.3.2015 (File No. 8), the Appellant stated that the name of the operator of the agency, sought at point No. 1, has not been provided. The Respondents stated that the information available in the dealership agreement has been provided and they have no further information to furnish. Therefore, in our view, no further action is due on point No. 1. As regards point No. 2, the CPIO is directed to provide to the Appellant the name and designation of the members of the selection / interview board. At point No. 3, the information sought is regarding the documents concerning financial capacity given by the dealer at the time of selection. This information, we note, is the personal information of the selected candidate and cannot be provided. The Appellant submitted that in response to point No. 3, he needs information regarding the premises offered by the selected candidate at the time of selection. However, as

stated above, the information sought at point No. 3 was regarding financial capacity and not the premises offered. The CPIO is directed to provide the name of the Regional Manager in response to point No. 4 of this RTI application.

5. The CPIO should comply with our above directives, within twenty days of the receipt of this order, under intimation to the Commission. Such information, as is provided, should be provided free of charge.

6. With the above directions and observations, the three appeals are disposed of.

7. Copies of this order be given free of cost to the parties.

Sd/-  
**(Sharat Sabharwal)**  
**Information Commissioner**

Authenticated true copy. Additional copies of orders shall be supplied against application and payment of the charges prescribed under the Act to the CPIO of this Commission.

**(Vijay Bhalla)**  
**Deputy Registrar**