7/14/25, 3:15 PM Action History

pplicant Name	MANISH VIJA				
ext of Appeal	Information Ac DFCCIL to my DFCCL/R/E/2! inadequate an transparency a Appeal:NonCodirected me to providing them provided in the apply here. Fa norms, also vin Norms (Query Schedule of D 2015/LMLI/19/distance betwee Western Railw whether 2.825 difference. Eva me to collect s Western Railw As per Section unavailability. Navailable but of response men W419.L.NOC(30meter norm 4 and 5):PIO of to homes. Inspecial claims and dordistance. Poor 7 and 9):Refer damage from a noncompliant. Allegations an MORLY/E/202 damage and ir ignored. Relief Circular No. 20 compensation applicability of	I am filing this First Appeal under Section 19(1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005, against the response provided by the PIO of DFCCIL to my RTI application (Registration No. DFCCL/R/E/25/00224). The reply referenced as RTI277 is inadequate and evasive, failing to fulfill the obligations of transparency and accountability under the RTI Act. Grounds for Appeal:NonCompliance with RTI Act. For Queries 1, 2, and 7, the PIO directed me to collect documents from DFCCIL Valsad office without providing them directly. Section 7(1) mandates information be provided in the form requested unless voluminous, which does not apply here. Failure to provide certified copies, especially safety norms, also violates the RTI Act. Incomplete Response on Safety Norms (Query 1):PIO cited a 2.825meter distance per DFCCIL Schedule of Dimension but ignored Railway Board Circular No. 2015/LMLI/19/2 dated 25.06.2015 which mandates a 30meter distance between railway lines and residential areas. Confirmed by Western Railway WRLMPTK/25/00058. The reply does not clarify whether 2.825 meters applies to residences or explain the difference. Evasive Reply on Survey Reports (Query 2):PIO asked me to collect survey reports without confirming their existence. Western Railway stated no survey was done in Mograwadi, Valsad. As per Section 7(8), the PIO must provide the reports or explain thei unavailability.NOC Clarity Lacking (Query 3):PIO said no NOC is available but did not clarify if one was required. DFCCIL grievance response mentions 3meter clearance as per Circular W419.L.NOC(GEN)III dated 28.05.2014, which contradicts the 30meter norm.No Safety Assessments or Detailed Reports (Queries 4 and 5):PIO claimed no safety assessments exist despite proximity to homes. Inspection report dated 07.04.2025 dismisses damage claims and does not address vibrations or actual 3meter distance.Poor Response on Compensation and Grievance (Queries 7 and 9):Reference to Railway Land Acquisition Act does not cover damage from operations. Asking me to collect doc			
teply of Appeal	Dear appellant, Your appeal has been considered and it is found tha 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.				
	Date of Action	Action Taken By	Remarks		
SN. Action Taken					
Action Taken 1 FIRST APPEAL RECEIVED	16/05/2025				

2	APPEAL FORWARDED TO CONCERNED FIRST APPELLATE AUTHORITY	19/05/2025	Nodal Officer	Online
3	APPEAL DISPOSED OF	14/07/2025	FAA - Sh. D. L. Yadav	