

**CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Club Building (Near Post Office)**  
**Old JNU Campus, New Delhi - 110067**  
**Tel: +91-11-26101592**

File No. CIC/BS/A/2015/001379/10412

25 May 2016

**Relevant Facts emerging from the Appeal:**

**Appellant** : Mr. Vikas Bakshi,  
R/o – 52/97, C. R. Park,  
New Delhi – 110019

**Respondent** : CPIO / ITO – Ward 65(5)  
**Department of Income Tax,**  
O/o the / ITO – Ward 65(5),  
Room No – 206, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor,  
Pratyakashkar Bhawan,  
B-Block, Civic Centre,  
New Delhi – 110001

ITO (HQRS-PERSONNEL),  
**Income Tax Department**  
RTI, ROOM NO.375A,  
CENTRAL REVENUES BUILDING,  
I.P. ESTATE, NEW DELHI-110 002

**RTI application filed on** : 16/02/2015  
**PIO replied on** : 11/03/2015  
**First appeal filed on** : 27/03/2015  
**First Appellate Authority order** : No Order  
**Second Appeal dated** : 03/07/2015

**Information sought:**

A complaint filed by the appellant dated 29/04/2014 was sent vide speed post against ACP Mahipal Singh and his wife Sudarshan. He wants to know the details of the action taken on the said complaint. Also provide the present status of the case/proceeding being held against Mahipal Singh u/s 148 Income Tax Act. What action has been taken against Mahipal Singh after the order of Delhi High Court and in respect of my complaint, provide action taken report.

**Grounds for the Second Appeal:**

The CPIO has not provided the desired information.

**Relevant Facts emerging during Hearing:**

The following were present

**Appellant:** Absent

**Respondent:** Mr. Kamal Kant CPIO

The appellant was given an opportunity to participate in the hearing but he is absent. The CPIO stated that at the time the RTI application was received assessment proceedings were

going on, however, the process has now been concluded and the broad outcome of the TEP will be intimated to the appellant.

**Decision notice:**

This Commission in its order dated 18/06/2013 (File No. CIC/RM/A/2012/000926 Sh. Ved Prakash Doda v/s ITO) has held as under:

“6. It has been the stand of the Commission that in respect of a tax evasion petition, once the investigation is completed, the appellant should be informed the broad results of the investigation, without disclosing any details. The appellant has a right to know as to whether the information provided by him was found to be true or false.”

In the matter at hand assessment proceedings have been completed. Hence, the CPIO should disclose the broad outcome of the TEP to the appellant, within 7 days from the date of receipt of this order.

**The appeal is disposed of accordingly.**

**BASANT SETH**  
**Information Commissioner**

**Authenticated true copy:**

**(R. L. Gupta)**  
**Dy. Registrar/Designated Officer**