

Central Information Commission, New Delhi
File No. CIC/SH/A/2016/000012
Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (19)

Date of hearing : 12th January 2017

Date of decision : 12th January 2017

Name of the Appellant : SHRI JAYESH RATHOD
33-B, MARUTIDHAM HOUSING
SOCIETY, DIWALIPURA, VADODARA,
GUJARAT-390007

Name of the Public Authority/Respondent : CENTRAL PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER,
GAIL INDIA LIMITED
GAIL BHAWAN, 16, BHIKAIJI CAMA
PLACE, NEW DELHI- 110066

RTI Application filed on : 25/10/2014

CPIO replied on : 14/11/2014

First Appeal filed on : 22/12/2014

First Appellate Authority order on : 28/01/2015

2nd Appeal received on : 27/11/2015

The Appellant was present at the NIC Studio, Vadodara.

On behalf of the Respondents, Shri B. M. Solanki, CPIO was present in person.

Information Commissioner : Shri Sharat Sabharwal

Information sought

1. How many of the employees (including name) had been reimbursed hotel expenses even after stipulated period of one month from issuance of a circular dated 31.5.2007 with regard to rational of transfer benefits till date, from all across GAIL (From 31.5.2007 till now)?
2. On what specific grounds, exceptions were made for these employees at point No. 1. by the policy department (detailed report why exception was approved by CA and copy of note sheets for each case of exception to be provided)?

3. Reasons recorded for rejection of his hotel expenses on note sheet, including a copy of the note sheet.

The CPIO reply

The CPIO provided information on point no. 3, concerning non reimbursement of hotel expenses to him and also provided copy of note sheets.

Grounds of the First Appeal

Not satisfied with the CPIO's reply.

Order of the First Appellate Authority

The FAA stated that the information on point No. 3 had already been provided and denied the information on point No. 1 & 2, stating that collecting the information on these points would disproportionately divert the resources of the Public Authority.

Grounds of the Second Appeal

Complete information not provided.

Relevant facts emerging during the Hearing, Discussion and Decision

The Appellant stated that the information sought by him at points No. 1 and 2 of his RTI application has not been provided and the information provided on point No. 3 is incomplete because copies of the relevant notings have not been given to him. The Respondents stated that at points No. 1 and 2, the Appellant had sought information regarding the employees who were reimbursed hotel expenses even after the stipulated period of one month from the issuance of a circular dated 31.5.2007, mentioned in the application, till the date of the RTI application. The information sought was regarding "all across GAIL". They further submitted that such information is not kept in a compiled form. They have thirty two stations with around four

thousand employees and collection of the above information since 2007 by consulting the relevant files would be difficult. The Respondents further submitted that in case the Appellant has any particular case in mind concerning reimbursement of hotel expenses, they can provide information concerning the same to him. As regards point No. 3, the Respondents submitted that a copy of the note-sheet regarding rejection of hotel expenses in the case of the Appellant was provided to him. The Appellant acknowledged having received this copy. In spite of our repeatedly asking him to specify the further information needed by him in respect of point No. 3, he was not able to specify any information and stated that at least the information on points No. 1 and 2 should be provided.

2. We have considered the submissions of both the parties and see no ground for any further action on point No. 3. Regarding points No. 1 and 2, in view of the position stated by the Respondents, we would not like to burden them with the task of collecting information from their thirty two stations, thereby disproportionately diverting their resources from their day to day work.

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

4. 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