

ACTION HISTORY OF RTI FIRST APPEAL No.DFCCIL/A/E/25/00021				
Applicant Name		Manish V Patel		
Text of Appeal		<p>I, Manish V Patel, resident of Mograwadi, Near Railway Station, Valsad, Gujarat, file this appeal under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, against the inadequate and manipulative response to my RTI application No. DFCCIL/R/T/25/00012, dated [Insert RTI Date], with response received on [Insert Response Date]. My house, legally owned since 1993 with valid property papers, is within 30 meters of DFCCIL railway tracks. As per Railway Board Guidelines, a minimum 30meter distance is required between main railway tracks and residential areas to protect residents from noise, vibrations, and structural damage. My house, within this prohibited zone, faces severe risks, yet DFCCIL has neither compensated nor relocated me. The RTI reply is misleading and evasive, violating my right to transparency. Grounds for Appeal: Violation of 30Meter Guideline: The RTI response ignores the Railway Board Guideline mandating a 30meter distance, falsely claiming a 3meter clearance is sufficient. My house, within 30 meters, violates this safety norm, endangering my family. The CPIO failed to justify this noncompliance. Demand: Provide certified copies of the Railway Board Guideline specifying the 30meter rule and explain why DFCCIL violated it in my case. Misleading Safety Inspection Claims: The response claims engineers conducted a safety check on 07.04.2025, finding no risks. These were ordinary employees, not qualified engineers, and they lacked equipment to measure vibrations, cracks, or noise from train operations. This false claim is manipulative. Demand: Conduct a proper inspection by certified structural engineers using vibration and noise measurement tools, and provide the detailed report. Denial of Compensation/Relocation: My house, predating the DFCCIL project, is within the 30meter danger zone, entitling me to compensation or relocation. The CPIO evaded this, offering no policy details. Demand: Provide DFCCILs policy on compensating or relocating residents within 30 meters and initiate action for my property. False and Evasive Responses: The response contains falsehoods, like claiming a valid safety check, and ignores the 30meter guideline. It fails to address structural risks despite my legal ownership since 1993. Demand: Investigate the CPIOs misleading replies and ensure accurate information. NonProvision of Documents: I requested certified copies of guidelines, safety audits, compensation policies, and my complaint. The CPIO provided none, violating Section 7(1) of the RTI Act. Demand: Furnish all requested documents in certified form, including the 30meter guideline and safety reports. Relief Sought: Order a safety inspection by qualified engineers with proper equipment to assess vibrations, noise, and cracks. Provide certified copies of all requested documents, including the 30meter guideline. Clarify and initiate compensation or relocation for my house. Take action against the CPIO for false and evasive response</p>		
Reply of Appeal		Dear appellant, Your appeal has been considered and it is found that you have been provided with available records/documents in person on 12.06.2025 at unit office, Mumbai. As such the appeal is disposed of.		
SN.	Action Taken	Date of Action	Action Taken By	Remarks
1	FIRST APPEAL RECEIVED	03/05/2025		
2	APPEAL FORWARDED TO CONCERNED FIRST APPELLATE AUTHORITY	05/05/2025	Nodal Officer	Online
3	APPEAL DISPOSED OF	16/07/2025	FAA - Sh. D. L. Yadav	
<input type="button" value="Print"/>				