

ACTION HISTORY OF RTI FIRST APPEAL No.DFCCL/A/E/25/00025				
<b>Applicant Name</b>		MANISH VIJAYBHAI PATEL		
<b>Text of Appeal</b>		<p>I, Manish Vijaybhai Patel, file this appeal under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005, against the incomplete response by the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO), DFCCIL, to my RTI request (No. DFCCL/R/E/25/00246) dated 04/04/2025. The reply, received around 02/05/2025, fails to provide requested information, violates RTI Act requirements, and ignores critical safety and accountability concerns. Grounds for Appeal: NonCompliance with RTI Act: The CPIO did not provide requested documents, including: Railway Board guidelines on track residence distance. Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) or safety audits. Reports/documents on complaint No. 100948/2025 filed with the Central Vigilance Commission (CVC). Safety inspection report of 07/04/2025. Compensation claim guidelines/formats. Under Section 7(1), the CPIO must provide information unless exempted under Sections 8 or 9. No exemptions were cited, making the response noncompliant. Incomplete Response on Complaint No. 100948/2025: My RTI sought details on the Chief Vigilance Officers (CVO) actions, investigation status, receipt date, and documents related to complaint No. 100948/2025. The CPIO provided no information, ignoring allegations of corruption and safety violations, raising transparency concerns. Conflicting Safety Norms: The CPIO cited Circular No. W419.L.NOC(GEN)III dated 28/05/2014, claiming a 3meter clearance between railway boundary and buildings. Western Railways response (File No: Engg/RTIA/237/2425) cites Circular No. 2015/LML1/19/2 dated 25/06/2015, mandating a 30meter distance with an NOC if less. The CPIO failed to: Provide the circular. Address the 3meter vs. 30meter discrepancy. Clarify NOC status for the track, 12.55 meters from my house. This impacts resident safety and requires clarification. Vague Responses: Queries on officials granting track clearance, audits, and corruption complaints were answered vaguely (e.g., competent authority, necessary audit) without specifics, violating RTI Act requirements. Dismissal of Damage Claims: The CPIO denied compensation, claiming no damage or vibrations per the 07/04/2025 inspection. The inspection report was not provided, and my claims of structural damage were not addressed. Ignoring Urgency: The RTI highlighted urgency due to safety hazards affecting life and liberty. The CPIOs response ignores this, violating Section 7(1). Relief Sought: Direct the CPIO to provide all requested information, including documents, CVO actions, official details, and compensation guidelines. Clarify the 3meter vs. 30meter norm and NOC status. Provide the 07/04/2025 inspection report and verify damage claims independently. Ensure a timely response due to urgency. Take action against the CPIO for noncompliance per Section 20.</p>		
<b>Reply of Appeal</b>		Dear appellant, You, vide your RTI have asked for the action taken w.r.t your complaint. As per the recorded position at the relevant time your complaint was not recorded by DFCCIL. In view of the above the CPIOs response was in order.		
SN.	Action Taken	Date of Action	Action Taken By	Remarks
1	FIRST APPEAL RECEIVED	10/05/2025		
2	APPEAL FORWARDED TO CONCERNED FIRST APPELLATE AUTHORITY	13/05/2025	Nodal Officer	Online
<input type="button" value="Print"/>				

3	APPEAL DISPOSED OF	19/06/2025	FAA - Sh. D. L. Yadav	