

**CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION**

2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, August Kranti Bhawan,  
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066

**Decision No. CIC/SB/A/2015/000440**

**Dated 30.11.2016**

**Appellant** : Shri Joe Antony,  
Inspector, Audit Circle-III,  
Central Excise Bhavan,  
Kathrikkadavu,  
Cochin-17.

**Respondent** : Central Public Information Officer  
O/o Commissioner of Customs,  
Custom House,  
Cohin-682009.

**Date of Hearing** : 30.11.2016

**Relevant dates emerging from the appeal:**

RTI application filed on : 12.03.2015

CPIO's reply : 30.03.2015

First appeal filed on : 29.04.2015

FAA's order : 19.06.2015

Second appeal filed on : 14.09.2015

**ORDER**

1. Shri Joe Antony filed an application dated 12.03.2015 under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) before the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO)/Dy. Commissioner of Customs, Unaccompanied Baggage Section, Custom House, Kochi, seeking inspection of documents in respect of clearance

---

of Unaccompanied Baggage by Customs including the Baggage Declaration Forms, Airway Bills, Offence Seizure Register, Offence Seizure Orders etc., for the period May, 2011 to July, 2011 at Sea Cargo Complex, Cochin and take certified copies of the relevant documents after inspection.

**2.** Shri Joe Antony 14.09.2015 filed a second appeal dated 04.02.2015 before the Commission on the grounds that the CPIO denied the information sought by him stating that disclosure of the information was exempted under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005 and that the First Appellate Authority (FAA) too upheld the decision of the CPIO. The appellant states that the grounds communicated by the FAA upholding the CPIO's reply are not at all maintainable and the information sought by him is exclusively in the public domain only and there is no reason to categorize the same as falling under the category of information, the disclosure of which is exempted under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. The appellant requested the Commission to direct the concerned CPIO to provide him access to the documents/information sought by him.

**Hearing:**

**3.** The appellant Shri Joe Antony was not present despite notice. The respondent Shri Jimmi Joseph, Assistant Commissioner and CPIO, O/o Commissioner of Customs attended the hearing through video conferencing.

**4.** The respondent submitted that the appellant was informed vide letter dated 30.03.2015 that the information sought relates to personal information of third-parties and hence, is exempted from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act. The respondent further submitted that there is no larger public interest involved in the disclosure of the information sought.

**Decision:**

5. The Commission, after hearing the submissions of the respondent and perusing the records, agrees with the respondent that the information sought by the appellant, relates to personal information of third-parties and hence, is exempted from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act. The Commission further observes that the disclosure of the information will also not serve any larger public interest. Hence, the information sought cannot be provided to the appellant.

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**