

Dedicated Freight Corridor Corporation of India Ltd.

(A Government of India Enterprises)

5th Floor, Pragati Maidan, Metro Station Building Complex, New Delhi- 110001 Registered Office: 101 A, Rail Bhawan, New Delhi- 110001, Web: www.dfccil.org

Date: 31.07.2014

No.HQ/PIO/RTI/143/14

Shri Rupender Sinhmar,

4, Aradhna Enclave, R.K. Puram, Sector-13, Opposite Hotel Hyatt, New Delhi-66.

Sub:

Information under RTI Act- 2005

Ref:

Your 1st appeal dt: 16.07.2014, received on 16.07.2014.

After carefull consideration of your appeal, on the above noted subject, remarks are furnished as under:-

S.No.	Comments
8. A), B), C)	You are factually incorrect in assuming that any information – during ar ongoing Bidding process- regarding details of constituents of Applicants for WDFC contract Package is available in Public domain. Had that been the case, this item would not have figured on the your referred application. You are also factually incorrect in assuming that any information – during
	ongoing bidding process - regarding acceptance of Bids submitted by individual Bidders for a WDFC Contract Package is in public domain.
	Acceptance of Bids (Submitted by individual Bidders) is linked with Bid Evaluation process and it is self explanatorily clear that any disclosure of information regarding and ongoing Bid Evaluation process is likely to jeopardize the competitive Position of respective Bidders.
8. D)	Your narration as to the last date of Submitting the Bid and the DFC being an important Contract for the Nation is factually incorrect.
8. E), F), G), H) I)	You - while reproducing the RTI Section 8.1 (d) which, inter alia, mention (There shall be no obligation to give any citizen (information) which would;) "harm the competitive position of third party", in sub Para no8.E) of First Appeal - does not mention the aforesaid sub part of the referred section in ensuing Para of the First Appeal 8.F).
	Your contention that PIO has not given any reason for denial of information is factually incorrect as in the response, PIO has clearly mentioned that "The information sought forms a vital part of ongoing Bidding process and its disclosure would jeopardize the competitive position of respective Bidders. Hence, denied under Clause no.8.1(d)".
	You have cited decisions given by Central Information Commission (CIC) in two separate Appeal cases. Both are not applicable in the captioned case as: While, in the former case, CIC takes exception to the contention placed before it that complaints received from third Party would harm the Cometitive position of the third Party, in the latter case, CIC clearly mentions "we also understand that the Bid Process is now over"
	It hardly needs elaboration that while the former case is out of context with the captioned application, in the second case, CIC has clearly specified that Bid Process was over which in the captioned case, is not.

8. J)	Your contention that PIO has denied information being hypothetical in nature is out of context and lacks proper appreciation. PIO has simply stated that answering (hypothetical) questions does not constitute Information's defined under section 2(f) of the RTI Act. The same has been uphelded by Commission is decision no. CIC/SM/A/2011/002976 dt. 24.09.12 in the case of Sh. Sandeep Kumar v/s DOPT. As regards, the aforesaid questions being hypothetical, the ifnoramiton sought under item no2, 4, & 5 (with item no3 & 6 of referred RTI application, in turn being interlinked with questions posed vide item no2 and item no5) of referred RTI application seek answers to questions stemming from
8. K)	You, by mentioning that you have received 'Nil' or 'Misleading'information has
	been factually incorrect regarding the information supplied being misleading because the Information sought has, justifiably, been provided under the extant RTI sections.

Accordingly your appeal is disposed off.

(Umesh Kumar Varine) GGM/Admn.

Copy to: GGM/PWC