

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

द्वितीय अपील संख्या / Second Appeal No. **CIC/IOCLD/A/2024/117856**

Shri Umesh Rathod

... अपीलकर्ता/Appellant

VERSUS/बनाम

PIO, Indian Oil Corporation Limited (IOCL)

...प्रतिवादीगण /Respondent

Date of Hearing : 15.07.2025

Date of Decision : 15.07.2025

Chief Information Commissioner : Shri Heeralal Samariya

Relevant facts emerging from appeal:

RTI application filed on : 31.12.2023

PIO replied on : - -

First Appeal filed on : 18.02.2024

First Appellate Order on : - -

2ndAppeal/complaint received on : 03.06.2024

Information sought and background of the case:

The Appellant filed an RTI application dated 31.12.2023 seeking information on the following points:-

"I, UMESH RATHOD (present RTI applicant), had filed vigilance complaints dated 05/04/2022, 13/05/2022, 11/07/2022 & 15/09/2022 against Indian Oil Corporation Limited before CHIEF VIGILANCE OFFICER, INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LIMITED, NEW DELHI for necessary enquiry into the malpractices and brazen violation of norms by Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Indore DO in the selection process of Loc. Sr. No. 1236 advertised on 14.12.2018.

Further, as per letter dated 05/09/23 (attached) issued by your corporation, the finalisation of the investigation report was under progress. However, after a considerable lapse of time of more than 3 months, the present application is filed in anticipation that the report has been finalised as per CVC timelines.

In view of the fact that the I, the present RTI applicant (UMESH RATHOD), am the complainant of the subject vigilance complaints dated 05/04/2022, 13/05/2022, 11/07/2022 & 15/09/2022, therefore, kindly provide the following information, keeping in view transparency, fairness and probity, under the Right to Information Act, 2005:

1. The result of the vigilance enquiries conducted on subject vigilance complaints dated 05/04/2022, 13/05/2022, 11/07/2022 & 15/09/2022.

2. Copy of the Enquiry Report in respect of subject vigilance complaints dated 05/04/2022, 13/05/2022, 11/07/2022 & 15/09/2022 filed by the present RTI applicant after redacting/removing/covering or otherwise severing under section 10 of the RTI Act, those portions of the enquiry report which, if, contain information regarding the identity of the enquiry officer(s), witness(es), third party(s) etc in line with the decisions of the Central Information Commission in N Balachandran Vs. PIO/ Vigilance & Dy. Chief Vigilance Officer, Southern Railway, Headquarters Office, Vigilance Branch, Chennai, File No.: CIC/AB/A/2016/001005 (Copy attached) and Madan Lal v. Northern Railway, Appeal No. CIC/SG/C/2009/00044/OP (Copy attached).”

Dissatisfied with the non-receipt of information from the CPIO, the Appellant filed a First Appeal dated 18.02.2024 which was not adjudicated by the FAA as per available records.

Aggrieved and dissatisfied, the Appellant approached the Commission with the instant Second Appeal.

Facts emerging in Course of Hearing:

A written submission dated 15.07.2025 has been received from the CPIO, IOCL stating that inadvertently the reply to the RTI application had not been provided. The Appellant has stated that the Appellant has filed eight RTI applications between March 2022 and December 2023, which revolve around selection process for a retail outlet (petrol pump) located at 1236, Thandla, Madhya Pradesh about legitimacy of the land ownership.

Hearing was scheduled after giving prior notice to both the parties.

Appellant: Not present

Respondent: Shri Prakash Abraham – CPIO/Chief General Manager (TA & ER); Shri Vishal; Shri Mudit Wahi were present during hearing. Shri Manish Patel – APIO/GM-HR, Mumbai was present through video conference

The Appellant was not present at the hearing nor did he submit any justification for his absence. The Respondent stated during hearing that the Appellant’s queries pertained to enquiries conducted with respect to vigilance complaints dated 05/04/2022, 13/05/2022, 11/07/2022 & 15/09/2022 filed by him. Though initially the disclosure of information had been declined since the investigation was pending, the enquiry process has now concluded and hence information as per the provisions of the RTI Act can be provided.

Decision:

Upon examination of the facts of the case the Respondent is directed to furnish the following: (i) a copy of the written submission dated 15.07.2025 with complete annexures and (ii) a copy of the enquiry report pertaining to the Appellant’s complaints, after redacting information which are barred from disclosure under Section 8 and 9 of the RTI Act.

The aforementioned directions should be duly complied within three weeks by the Respondent and a compliance report submitted before the Commission within four

weeks of receipt of this order. It is made clear that non adherence of these directions shall attract initiation of *suo motu* penal action as per law.

The appeal is disposed off with these directions.

Heeralal Samariya (हीरालाल सामरिया)
Chief Information Commissioner (मुख्य सूचना आयुक्त)

Authenticated true copy
(अभिप्रमाणित सत्यापित प्रति)

S. K. Chitkara (एस. के. चिटकारा)
Dy. Registrar (उप-पंजीयक)
011-26186535



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

Nil