1. Admin section of DoC has given reply vide letter dated 20.11.19 that there is no complaint against applicant. therefore vigilance department has given reply that complaint against applicant is under examination in vigilance division in consultation with administrative division of SEEPZ, is misleading.

2. There is no harm in giving applicant’s complaint to applicant and how providing applicant’s complaint copy will impede the process of investigation.

3. Honble CIC discussed in length regarding denial of information basis of section 8(1)(h) of RTI Act, 2005. Inspite of that CPIO did not provide information citing reason as section 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act, 2005 which is gross violation of CIC observations and thereafter above decision vide decision no CIC/DOCOM/A/2018/158959/02003 dated 30.10.19

4. Apex court in various decisions has directed that principal of natural justice to be followed in all proceedings.

5. The Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in B.S. Mathur v. PIO in W.P. (C) 295 of 2011 dated 03.06.2011 had held that:

"19. The question that arises for consideration has already been formulated in the Court's order dated 21st April 2011: Whether the disclosure of the information sought by the Petitioner to the extent not supplied to him yet would "impede the investigation" in terms of Section 8(1)(h) RTI Act" The scheme of the RTI Act, its objects and reasons indicate that disclosure of information is the rule and non-disclosure the exception. A public authority which seeks to withhold information available with it has to show that the information sought is of the nature specified in Section 8 RTI Act. As regards Section 8(1)(h) RTI Act, which is the only provision invoked by the Respondent to deny the Petitioner the information sought by him, it will have to be shown by the public authority that the information sought "would impede the process of investigation." The mere reproducing of the wording of the statute would not be sufficient when recourse is had to Section 8(1)(h)RTI Act. The burden is on the public authority to show in what manner the disclosure of such information would 'impede' the investigation..............
22. ...........The mere pendency of an investigation or inquiry is by itself not a sufficient justification for withholding information. It must be shown that the disclosure of the information sought would "impede" or even on a lesser threshold "hamper" or "interfere with" the investigation. This burden the Respondent has failed to discharge."

Prayer

It is, therefore, most respectfully prayed that My Lords be pleased to

(i) Direct CPIO to provide information as sought

(ii) Such other orders be also passed in favour of the appellant as deemed fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.

Thanking You