

**Central Information Commission, New Delhi**  
**File No. CIC/SH/A/2016/000080**  
**Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (19)**

**Date of hearing** : 16th January 2017

**Date of decision** : 16th January 2017

**Name of the Appellant** : **SHRI PARBODH CHANDER BALI**  
**16, SHIV NAGAR, BATALA ROAD,**  
**AMRITSAR-143001**

**Name of the Public Authority/Respondent** : **CENTRAL PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER,**  
**INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LIMITED**  
**PUNJAB STATE OFFICE, INDIAN**  
**OIL BHAWAN,, PLOT NO.- 3-A,**  
**SECTOR-19 A, MADHYA MARG,**  
**CHANDIGARH- 160019**

**RTI Application filed on** : 29/08/2015

**CPIO replied on** : 05/10/2015

**First Appeal filed on** : 05/10/2015

**First Appellate Authority order on** : 10/11/2015

**2<sup>nd</sup> Appeal received on** : 07/12/2015

The Appellant was present at the NIC Studio, Amritsar.

On behalf of the Respondents, Shri Sanjay Bhandari, APIO was present at the NIC Studio, Chandigarh.

**Information Commissioner** : **Shri Sharat Sabharwal**

**Information sought**

This matter concerns an RTI application filed by the Appellant, seeking information on six points regarding the list of employees working with Indane Gas Distributors and petrol pumps in the Amritsar Municipal Corporation area, their pay & perks, instructions issued in respect of their minimum wages and benefits by way of uniform etc.

## **The CPIO reply**

The CPIO gave a point wise reply to the Appellant.

## **Grounds of the First Appeal**

Not satisfied with the CPIO's reply on point nos. 5 and 6.

## **Order of the First Appellate Authority**

The FAA stated that the information sought had already been provided and asked the Appellant for inspection of records.

## **Grounds of the Second Appeal**

Complete information not provided.

## **Relevant facts emerging during the Hearing, Discussion and Decision**

The Appellant stated that he was not satisfied with the response of the CPIO to points No. 5 and 6 of his RTI application. With regard to point No. 5, he stated, in particular, that he wants the details and break up of the subsidy of Rs. 5.09 lakhs disbursed to the dealers and mentioned in the CPIO's reply dated 5.10.2015. He also stated that the CPIO did not respond to the specific query at point No. 6.

2. The Respondents submitted that the Appellant had been asked to inspect the records concerning disbursement of the subsidy of Rs. 5.09 lakhs, but he did not do so. The Appellant claimed that no such clear offer was made to him.

3. We have considered the records and the submissions of both the parties. With reference to point No. 5 of the RTI application, Shri Sanjay Bhandari, APIO is directed to provide to the Appellant a copy of the guidelines / rules as per which the subsidy mentioned in the CPIO's reply dated 5.10.2015 was disbursed. Shri Bhandari is further directed to facilitate inspection of the detailed records, concerning the reimbursement of the subsidy, by the Appellant. After such inspection, he should be

given detailed break up of the total amount of Rs. 5.09 lakhs along with the names of the dealers to whom the subsidy was disbursed. It will be for Shri Sanjay Bhandari to contact the Appellant to schedule a mutually convenient date and time for the inspection. Regarding point No. 6, the APIO is directed to respond to the specific query of the Appellant regarding any other articles given for the benefit of staff of the sales points. Shri Sanjay Bhandari, APIO should comply with our above directives, within twenty days of the receipt of this order, under intimation to the Commission. The information should be provided free of charge.

4. With the above directions and observations, the appeal is disposed of.
5. 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