

केन्द्रीय सूचना आयोग
Central Information Commission
बाबा गंगनाथ मार्ग, मुनिरका
Baba Gangnath Marg, Munirka
नई दिल्ली, New Delhi – 110067

File No: CIC/IOCLD/A/2025/135482

Indra Jeet

.....अपीलकर्ता/Appellant

VERSUS

बनाम

CPIO : Indian Oil Corporation Limited,
Pipelines Division A-1, Udyog Marg,
Sector-1, Noida -201301, UP.

....प्रतिवादीगण /Respondent

Date of Hearing : 23-04-2026

Date of Decision : 23-04-2026

INFORMATION COMMISSIONER : Khushwant Singh Sethi

Relevant facts emerging from appeal:

RTI application filed on : 29-04-2025

CPIO replied on : 09-06-2025

First appeal filed on : 25-06-2025

First Appellate Authority's order : 22-08-2025

2nd Appeal dated : 29-09-2025

Information sought:

1. The Appellant filed an RTI application dated 29-04-2025 seeking the following information:

[1] Certified copy of note sheet indicating notings by various officials and decision of competent authority on my above mentioned complaint/grievance dated January 01, 2025.

[2] Certified copy of investigation report or feedback obtained with respect to the grievances raised in my above mentioned complaint dated January 01, 2025.

[3] Certified copy of the note sheet indicating notings by various officials and decision of competent authority on investigation report or feedback obtained with respect to the issues raised in my above mentioned complaint dated January 01, 2025.

[4] Certified copy of letter, directions and/or instructions issued to concerned authority/subordinate office as a follow up action based on investigation report or feedback on my above mentioned complaint dated January 01, 2025.

[5] In case no action is taken on my complaint dated January 01, 2025, please inform me the name of officer(s) and staff responsible, but failed to take action on my above mentioned complaint dated January 01, 2025.

[6] Certified copy of your rules or citizens charter or any other document stipulating the time frame in number of days by which such a complaint/matter should have been dealt with and resolved by your public authority.

[7] An inquiry was conducted against Shri Rajat Agrawal, Shri Ishwar Singh Yadav & Others Officer of TOCL pursuant to my complained send to Shri Shrikant Madhav Vaidya, Chairman of INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LIMITED, Indian Oil Bhavan, G-9, Ali Yavar Jung Marg, Bandra (East), Mumbai-400051.

Subject - A case of inaction, harassment and highhandedness abuse of power and breach of trust by Shri Rajat Agrawal, Shri Ishwar Singh Yadav & Others Officer of IOCL

Provide me certified copies of the inquiry report action taken report along with file noting, note sheet and order in the same."

2. The CPIO furnished a reply to the Appellant on 09-06-2025 stating as under:

"1. The required information has been already furnished to you vide letter dated 10.02.2025 (Annexure A) in reply to your complaint dated 01.01.2025.

No additional information is available in this regard.

2. Kindly refer to reply given at sl. No. 1.

3. Kindly refer to reply given at sl. No. 1.

4. Kindly refer to reply given at sl. No. 1.
5. Kindly refer to reply given at sl. No. 1.
6. The time frame for resolution of complaints/matters varies depending on the nature of the issue and the applicable rules or guidelines governing the subject matter. No single consolidated document stipulates a uniform timeline for all types of complaints
7. No information is available on records in this regard”

3. Being dissatisfied, the Appellant filed a First Appeal dated 25-06-2025. The FAA vide its order dated 22-08-2025, held as under:

“Upon perusing the RTI applications and the replies by CPIO dated 09.06.2025, w.r.t. your queries. The undersigned holds that the queries asked by the Appellant has been appropriately addressed. No additional information is available in this regard.”

4. Feeling aggrieved and dissatisfied, Appellant approached the Commission with the instant Second Appeal.

Relevant Facts emerged during Hearing:

The following were present:-

Appellant: Appellant’s authorized representative Mr. Dharam Pal, attended the hearing through video conference.

Respondent: Mr. Rajender Prasad, CGM (HR); Ms. Deepali Pandey, GM (HR) and Mr. Avinash, AM (HR), attended the hearing in person.

5. The Appellant’s authorized representative (hereinafter referred to as AR), submitted that the appellant sent a complaint dated 01.01.2025 to the Chairman, IOCL, Mumbai. The AR also submitted that the appellant sought copy of note sheets, indicating notings by various officials and decisions of Competent Authority on the above-mentioned complaint, Certified copy of investigation report or feedback obtained with respect to the aforesaid grievance etc. The AR further submitted, that the respondent has not provided the sought information. The AR also submitted, that the respondent’s staff took the

statement of the appellant with respect to his complaints. Hence, he understands that an inquiry took place in the matter mentioned in point no.7

6. The Respondent submitted, that the appellant made complaints on various dates. The respondent also submitted, that all the said complaints pertain to same subject matter i.e., regarding crop compensation to be paid to the appellant. The respondent submitted, that they had provided letter dated 10.02.2025 with respect to the sought action taken on his complaint. The respondent further submitted, that the aforesaid letter is the only available information. Hence, the same was provided as reply on the remaining points. The respondent also submitted, that all crop compensation, as was due to the appellant, has been fully paid to him.

7. The Commission queried the respondent, as to how did they provide letter dated 10.02.2025 as a response to the point no.1 in several similar RTI applications. To this, the respondent submitted, that since the subject matter is same in different complaints, the reply dated 10.02.2025 was provided to the appellant. To this, the AR responded that the subject matters were different. The Commission queried the respondent as to whether, they can provide the note sheets, correspondences issued by their department with respect to the complaint dated 01.01.2025 sent to Chairman, IOCL, Mumbai. To this, the respondent agreed.

Decision:

8. The Commission, after adverting to the facts and circumstances of the case, hearing both the parties and perusal of the records, observes that the respondent did not give an appropriate reply to the appellant vide letter dated

09.06.2025. The respondent is directed to provide a revised point-wise reply to the appellant, incorporating the sought information for: **point no. 1** - copy of note sheets indicating notings by various officials and decisions of Competent Authority on complaint/grievance dated 01.01.2025; **point no.2** – copy of investigation report or feedback obtained with respect to the grievance dated 01.01.2025; **point no.3** - copy of the note sheet indicating notings by various officials and decision of competent authority on investigation report or feedback obtained with respect to the issues raised in complaint dated 01.01.2025; **point no.4** - copy of letter, directions and/or instructions issued to concerned authority/subordinate office, as a follow up action. based on investigation report or feedback on complaint dated 01.01.2025; **point no.5** – Designation of the concerned officer who is responsible to take action on the complaint dated 01.01.2025, sent by the appellant; **point no.6** – specific website link to access the citizens charter, rules stipulating the time frame in number of days by which such a complaint/matter should have been dealt with and resolved by the respondent; **point no.7** – broad outcome/action taken in the inquiry mentioned by the appellant. **The respondent is also directed to obtain the sought information from the concerned CPIO at the Office of Chairman, IOCL, Mumbai and provide the appropriate information to the appellant.**

9. The respondent CPIO is directed to provide all the sought certified copies in the aforesaid revised point-wise reply by endorsing the documents as per point no.2 of the Office Memorandum dated 06.10.2015 issued by the Department of Personnel & Training. The respondent is also directed to redact third-party information such as officer's names, identity etc. in consonance with Section 10 of the RTI Act, 2005.

10. The respondent shall provide the aforesaid revised point-wise reply to the appellant, within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order, under intimation to the Commission - both through post and via uploading on <http://dsscic.nic.in/online-link-paper-compliance/add>. Accordingly, the appeal is disposed of.

Copy of the decision be provided free of cost to the parties.

(Khushwant Singh Sethi) (खुशवन्त सिंह सेठी)
Information Commissioner (सूचना आयुक्त)
दिनांक/Date: 23.04.2026

Authenticated true copy

S. K. Chitkara (एस. के. चिटकारा)

Dy. Registrar (उप-पंजीयक)

011-26107026

Copy To:

1. The CPIO
Indian Oil Corporation Limited,
Pipelines Division A-1, Udyog Marg,
Sector-1, Noida -201301, UP
2. The FAA,
Indian Oil Corporation Limited,
Pipelines Division A-1, Udyog Marg,
Sector-1, Noida -201301, UP
3. Indra Jeet

Recomendation(s) to PA under section 25(5) of the RTI Act, 2005:-

Nil