

SPEED POST

संदर्भ संख्या / Ref No: NESH/ PESM/ RTI/ 1117/ 270

दिनांक / Date: 13.01.2023

To,

Nabam Nakap
C/o. Nabam Yapu, Rono Village,
Doimukh, Papum Pare District
Arunachal Pradesh – 791112
+91-8731948019

विषय: आपका आरटीआई आवेदन दिनांक 10.10.2022 और अपील दिनांक 29.12.2022 दिनांक 04.01.2023 को सीपीआईओ कार्यालय में प्राप्त हुआ।

Sub: Your RTI Application dated. 10.10.2022 & appeal dated. 29.12.2022 received at CPIO office on 04.01.2023.

Sir,

- 1.0 This has reference to your RTI application dated 10.10.2022 & appeal dated. 29.12.2022 under RTI Act, 2005 received at CPIO office on 04.01.2023.
- 2.0 As advised vide Order of Appellate Authority vide NESH/ED/RTI/898, dated. 09.01.2023, the information pertaining to your RTI appeal is given below:

Sl.	Query	Information
(i)	Furnish the copy of the Detail Project Report of 132kV S/C (On D/C Tower) Seppa-Rillo, Rillo-Seijosa, Rillo-Sagalee by the Power Grid Corporation of India Limited. Bharat Jhunjhunwala vs Central Electricity Authority on 24 March, 2017, Supreme Court judgement	The information sought is in nature of commercial confidence and disclosure of the same is exempted as per RTI provisions under Section 8(1)(d) of RTI Act, 2005. The CIC judgement regarding – “Bharat Jhunjhunwala vs Central Electricity Authority on 24 March, 2017” is also in favour of this reply. The judgement is attached as Annexure-I .

आपको धन्यवाद,

भवदीय,



(A L SYNGKON)
Sr. DGM & CPIO
0364-2536439,

nerts_rti@powergrid.co.in

Copy: Appellate Authority & CGM(I/c), NERTS, POWERGRID, Shillong

Central Information Commission

Bharat Jhunjunwala vs Central Electricity Authority on 24 March, 2017

ENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
August Kranti Bhawan, Bhikaji Cama Place,
New Delhi-110066

F.No. CIC/SS/A/2014/000197-YA

F.No. CIC/SS/A/2014/000198-YA

F.No. CIC/SS/A/2014/000212-YA

Date of Hearing : 06.04.2016 & 27.05.2016
Date of Decision : 01.09.2016
Complainant/Appellant : Shri Bharat Jhunjunwala
Tehri, Uttarakhand
Through:
Ms. Parul Gupta, Advocate
Respondent : Central Electricity Authority
New Delhi
Through:
[
Ms. Anita Gehlot, Director/CPIO
Ms. Curiya Subrahmoni, Director
Shri Venkat Subhaiah

Jai Prakash Power Ventures Ltd.

(Third party/ Intervener) Through:

Shri M.M. Sibbal, Vice President Shri Rohan Pradhan

Alaknanda Hydro Power Co. Ltd.

(Third party/ Intervener) Through:

Shri S. Dhawan L&T Uttaranchal Hydro Power Ltd.

(Third party/ Intervener) Through:

Shri Anuj Sharma, Advocate With F. No. CIC/SS/A/2014/000338-YA Complainant/Appellant : Shri Bharat Jhunjunwala Tehri, Uttarakhand Through:

Ms. Parul Gupta, Advocate

Respondent

T.H.D.C. India Ltd.
Dehradun

Order

1. Since the present appeals involve common questions of fact as well as law, they are being taken up together for disposal. Information sought in the respective RTI applications wherefrom the present appeals emanate is reproduced hereinafter:

In CIC/SS/A/2014/000197-YA, the appellant sought:

(i) Detailed Project Report (DPR) of Srinagar Hydro Electric Project on Alaknanda (River). [Executed by M/s Alaknanda Hydro Power Co. Ltd.] In CIC/SS/A/2014/000198-YA, the appellant sought:

- (i) Executive Summary of DPR.
- (ii) Tehno Economic Concurrence.

For Singoli-Bhatwari and Phanta-Byung Hydro Electric Project on Alaknanda (River). [Executed by M/s L&T Uttaranchal Hydropower Ltd.] In CIC/SS/A/2014/000212-YA, the appellant sought:

- (i) Detailed Project Report.
- (ii) Executive Summary of DPR.

(iii) Tehno Economic Concurrence, original with revisions, if any.

(iv) Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) For Vishnu Prayag hydro electric project on Alaknanda river. [Executed by M/s Jaiprakash Power Ventures Ltd.] In CIC/SS/A/2014/000338-YA, the appellant sought:

(i) Copy of Detailed Project Report of Vishnugad-Pipalkoti Hydro electric project on river Alaknanda.

[The project is being executed by respondent M/s THDC Ltd, - a joint venture of GoI & Govt. of U.P.]

2. The Central Electricity Authority (hereinafter 'CEA') is a creation of law, constituted under Section 70 of the Electricity Act, 2003. Section 73 of the Electricity Act, 2003 lays Functions and duties of the Authority. Section 74 empowers the CEA to require data from a generating company:

Section 74: (Power to require statistics and returns): It shall be the duty of every licensee, generating company or person generating electricity for its or his own use to

furnish to the Authority such statistics, returns or other information relating to generation, transmission, distribution, trading and use of electricity as it may require and at such times and in such form and manner as may be specified by the Authority.

3. The appellant sought the aforesaid information regarding various hydro electric projects built on river Alaknanda from CEA being statutory custodian of copy of DPR. It is pertinent to mention here that a DPR is creation of respective project developers and made available to CEA for obtaining statutory clearances under the Electricity Act, 2003. Thus, it is settled that none of the DPRs of respective Hydroelectric Projects are creation of CEA.

4. The CPIO, CEA sought views/consent of the respective project developers before replying to the appellant. The project developers, who are arrayed as Interveners before the Commission, objected to the proposed disclosure of the information on various grounds.

5. The CPIO, CEA having considered the objections raised by respective project developers declined the information sought as follows:

Please refer to your RTI application no. 555, dated 7.6.2013 regarding providing a copy of DPR of Srinagar HEP. Being 3rd party information, M/s AHPCL was requested to give their consent/views and a copy was enclosed to you requesting to approach the project authority directly. Since DPR is the property of the developer, you are again requested to approach the developer. Further, the matter is sub judice, information sought can't be provided.

6. The appellant preferred first appeal whereupon the FAA upheld the decision of CPIO. Feeling aggrieved with the FAO the appellant preferred the present statutory second appeals.

7. Upon perusal of respective contentions raised by the parties, following questions arise for determination by the Commission:

i. What is the nature and import of the information sought and whether the plea of Section 8(1)(e) of RTI Act is maintainable ?

ii. Whether the plea of Section 8(1)(d) & Section 9 comes to rescue of respondent CEA & the interveners?

iii. Whether there is any larger public interest involved which warrants the disclosure of information sought?

8. As per the mandate of section 19(5) of the RTI Act, 2005, onus was put upon the respondent to show cause that the information sought is exempted from disclosure.

9. The respondent as well as 3rd party interveners in the respective appeals were heard at length. It is contended on the behalf of respondent CEA that the information sought is held by them in course of their statutory role as a regulatory body under the Electricity Act, 1973 and thus there exists

element of fiduciary relationship between it and the respective project developers. In this backdrop, respondent CEA claimed exemption u/s 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act. Section 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act is reproduced hereinafter:

Section 8 - Exemption from disclosure of information:- (1) Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act, there shall be no obligation to give any citizen,--

xxx

(e) Information available to a person in his fiduciary relationship, unless the competent authority is satisfied that the larger public interest warrants the disclosure of such information.

The expression 'person' occurring in Section 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act has to be construed as per definition enumerated in the General Clauses Act, 1897. The same reads as:

"person" shall include any company or association or body of individuals, whether incorporated or not.

Thus, CEA being a statutory body does fall within the expression 'person' as occurring in Section 8(1)(e). It is undisputed fact that the respondent CEA lays its hands on the information in exercise of statutory & regulatory character. The project developers-interveners are required to submit Detailed Project Report of proposed hydro projects by the operation of provisions of Electricity Act, 2005. The information sharing between the CEA & private developers is due to operation of law, thus, it can be safely concluded that there exist elements of fiduciary relationship between the respondent & third party interveners. Regulation 11 of Central Electricity Authority (Furnishing of Statistics, Returns and Information) Regulations, 2007 also fortifies this position. The said regulation is reproduced hereinafter:

11. Restriction on publication of information and returns - (1) No information, no individual return and no part thereof with respect to any particular industrial or commercial concern, given for the purposes of these regulations shall, without the previous consent in writing of the owner for the time being of the industrial or commercial concern in relation to which the information revealing the commercial and technical confidentiality, be published in such manner as would enable any particulars to be identified as referring to a particular concern.

(2) Except for the purposes of these regulations, no person who is not engaged in the collection of statistics under these regulations shall be permitted to see any information or individual return referred to in sub-section (1).

This is clear from the preceding discussion that the respondent CEA is enjoined with a duty to treat information received in course of exercise of its statutory powers as confidential. Due to existence of fiduciary relationship between the respondent CEA & respective private developers, the plea of

Section 8(1)(e) is found tenable.

10. Another limb of contention advanced by respondent CEA is that the information sought attracts exemption under clause (d) of Section 8(1) of the RTI Act, 2005 being commercially sensitive. It is contended on the behalf of respondent as well as interveners/ objectors that disclosure of the information would jeopardize the commercial interest of the interveners-third party private developers. Supporting the aforesaid contention of respondent CEA, it has been contended on behalf of respective third party interveners that the DPR is a 'literary work' incorporating technical knowhow, skills and expertise of engineering thereby involving considerable development cost and thus the same warrants protection as an intellectual property. To augment their contention they produced the records of original DPR of Alaknanda Power Project before the Commission. It is further averred that the DPR being the guiding document of the respective project contains nitty-gritty of project development and hence it is confidential document. Another argument advanced by the 3rd party interveners is that any revelation of the DPR or its executive summary or the terms of technical clearance granted by the regulator CEA would jeopardize their commercial interest and place them in a disadvantageous position vis-a- vis with their competitors. It is vehemently argued by the 3rd party interveners that disclosure of DPR would necessarily result it into losing competitive edge over other competing developers.

11. In order to weigh the submissions made by the respondent as well as 3rd party interveners, it becomes imperative to analyse the ingredients and nature of:

a. Detailed Project Report b. Executive Summary of DPR.

c. Tehno Economic Concurrence d. Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) a. Detailed Project Report Detailed project report is a document for determination of key factors for decision-making, approval, planning & execution of a project. Detailed project report acts as foundation stone for planning & execution of the project. Preparation of detailed project report is a step in firming up of the proposal. It invariably includes, but not limited to:

i. Technological parameters.

ii. Description of the technology.

iii. Broad technical specification.

iv. Evaluation of the existing resources.

v. Schedule plan.

vi. General layout.

vii. Engineering designs/drawings.

viii. Volume of work.

It has been contended that DPR is a highly technical document, which is prepared after rigorous research regarding the viability of project, constructional details &

operational details of power project. A person of ordinary prudence cannot comprehend much about it. In the present case, the DPR of each power project involved runs over a thousand pages.

The term 'Intellectual Property' as occurring in clause (d) of Section 8(1) of the RTI Act, 2005 is not statutorily defined. The Oxford English Dictionary, 12th ed. defines it as 'intangible property that is the result of creativity, e.g. patents or copyrights.' The Merriam Webster online dictionary defines it as 'property that derives from the work of the mind or intellect; specifically : an idea, invention, trade secret, process, program, data, formula, patent, copyright, or trademark or application, right, or registration relating thereto.' Contrasting the term 'Intellectual Property' u/s 8(1)(d) with the term 'Copyright' as employed in Section 9 of the RTI Act, the clear intent of legislature can be inferred. Whereas, copyright is a narrower phenomena and a sub species; the term Intellectual property refers to any work of intellect. The expression intellectual property is used in its generic sense in clause (d).

I am left with no doubt that DPRs under reference not only contain information of commercial confidence, but also fall within the expression intellectual property and thus the exemption claimed under Section 8(1)(d) is held to be tenable.

Another exemption u/s 7(9) is claimed by respondent on the premise that even a single DPR consists of more than 1000 pages and being voluminous, the exercise to disclose the same would disproportionately divert the resources of the public authority. Since, it has already been concluded in the preceding discussion that DPR of hydro electric projects enbloc would qualify for exemption u/s 8(1)(e) & (d); the Commission doesn't deem it fit to delve into the present question, which would be merely academic.

b. Executive Summary of DPR An executive summary also referred to as management summary, is a short document or section of a document, produced for business purposes, that summarizes a longer report or proposal or a group of related reports in such a way that readers can rapidly become acquainted with a large body of material without having to read the whole document. Executive summary of DPR outlines the key features and broad outline of the project. The Commission is appraised that many of the projects developers voluntarily place executive summary in public domain. The interveners - third parties present before the Commission state to have no objection if the executive summary is made public.

c. Tehno Economic Concurrence (TEC) Planning and appraisal of a hydro electric project is a highly specialised task that requires detailed analysis of various integrated operational studies, power potential studies, storage hydro schemes, determination of installed capacity and preparation of detail project reports (DPRs). Once this work is done, DPRs need to be submitted for scrutiny and clearance from Central Electricity Authority (CEA) as per the mandate of Section 8 of the Electricity Act, which reads as:

Section 8 - Hydro-electric generation (1) Notwithstanding anything contained in section 7, any generating company intending to set up a hydro-generating station

shall prepare and submit to the Authority for its concurrence, a scheme estimated to involve a capital expenditure exceeding such sum, as may be fixed by the Central Government, from time-to-time, by notification.

(2) The Authority shall, before concurring in any scheme submitted to it under sub-section (1) have particular regard to, whether or not in its opinion,--

(a) the purposed river-works will prejudice the prospects for the best ultimate development of the river or its tributaries for power generation, consistent with the requirements of drinking water, irrigation, navigation, flood-control, or other public purposes, and for this purpose the Authority shall satisfy itself, after consultation with the State Government, the Central Government, or such other agencies as it may deem appropriate, that an adequate study has been made of the optimum location of dams and other river-works;

(b) the proposed scheme meets the norms regarding dam design and safety.

(3) Where a multi-purpose scheme for the development of any river in any region is in operation, the State Government and the generating company shall co-ordinate their activities with the activities of the persons responsible for such scheme insofar as they are inter-related.

As regards TEC, the respondents and interveners concede and voluntarily offer to disclose the same to the appellant.

d. Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) This agreement provides for the terms and conditions for which a generating company agrees to sell the power for distribution through a grid. The interveners state the same to be exempted under Section 8(1)(d) since it contains the terms of sale of power and the pricing details. The Commission concurs with the contention of the interveners.

12. Since the respondent and 3rd party interveners have justified non disclosure of information u/s 8(1)(d)&(e), the onus to show cause larger 'public interest' which would warrant the disclosure of information sought is shifted on the appellant.

13. Ms. Parul Gupta, learned counsel appearing for appellant contends that the DPR is a public document within the meaning of section 76 of Indian Evidence Act, 1891 and thus being a public record no exemption u/s 8(1) of the RTI Act, 2005 could be invoked to prevent its disclosure. Another limb of contention advanced by the learned counsel for appellant is that the execution of Hydro electric project is a public function which is out sourced to a private developer and thus a document related to discharge of public function cannot be kept under wraps. However, the Commission finds the contention of the appellant to be misplaced. The Right to Information is a special code which is exhaustive and self reliant. It marks no distinction between 'public' or 'private' record. Once it is established that information is either available or accessible by a public authority, the same is mandated to be disclosed. The only rider thereto is Section 8 of the RTI Act. Thus,

Section 8(1) remains the sole touchstone to ascertain whether information qualifies for disclosure or not. Thus, there is no need to undertake the academic exercise of whether the information sought forms part of public record or not. In the present facts, information is held to be exempt from disclosure under clauses (d) & (e) of Section 8(1).

14. Another limb of contention advanced by the appellant is that wider public interest warrants disclosure of information sought. The Ld. Counsel strenuously argues that due to the excessive disturbance caused by hydro project development activities, the ecological balance of the Uttarakhand valley has been damaged beyond repair. The 3rd party interveners apprise the Commission that the hydro projects in question have withstood many rounds of protracted litigation. They clarify that the Honourable Supreme Court had already evaluated ecological impact of the project development and granted a clean chit in the matter. Attention of the Commission is invited towards the chronology of the issue of judicial intervention on the issue of project development. Relevant portion from the pleadings of 3rd party intervener is reproduced hereinafter:

8. It is further submitted that with this background, AHPCL had commenced Project development works from the year 2005. The Appellant, Mr. Bharat Jhunjhunwala, has filed several cases that include Writ Petitions under the guise of Public Interest Litigations before the Hon'ble Supreme Court (SLP No. 15423 of 2011 and C.A No. 6736 of 2013), the High Court of Uttarakhand (W.P. No. 137 of 2009 and 68 of 2012), the National Green Tribunal (NGT) (Appeal No. 9 of 2011) and before the Central Empowered Committee (CEC, appointed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, Case No. 1237 of 2009), against the AHPCL, Government of Uttar Pradesh (UPSEB), Government of Uttarakhand ('GoUK') and Ministry of Environment and Forests ("MoEF"). In this said cases, the Appellant had raised issues relating to the Project parameters and about certain discrepancies in the technical documents relating the Project, including but not limited to the Detailed Project Reports (DPRs') that were duly approved by the Respondent and other competent Government authorities. It is apt to submit that the Appellant once again sought copies of the same DPRs' from the Respondent, CEA under the present appeal. As such, the information sought from CEA is already available with the Appellant and using the said documents, the Appellant had contested the above referred cases against the AHPCL. It is further pertinent to submit here that in all the above referred cases, the Appellant had submitted copies of relevant pages of DPRs' and had challenged the validity of Environmental Clearances ("EC") accorded to the Project, among other grounds.

Initially, the Appellant had contested the said issued before the Hon'ble High Court of Uttarakhand in W.P. No. 137 of 2009. After considering the pleadings, the Hon'ble High Court had directed the Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India ("MoEF") to look into the matter and give its 'Specific Decision' as to the validity and legality of the ECs' accorded to the project with its original as well as revised parameters. It is apt to submit here that as stated above, the Project was originally conceptualised as a 200MW HEP in the year 1980 and relevant DPR was prepared by the then Government of U.P in the year 1981. Subsequently, the Project capacity was revised from 200MW to 330MW, for which another DPR was prepared in the year 1985 by the then Government

of U.P. Subsequently, Forest Clearance was also granted accordingly. It may be not out of place to submit here that the EC was granted by the MoEF only after careful consideration of the Environment Impact Assessment Reports ("EIA Reports") prepared and submitted for approval, in line with the technical parameters mentioned in the DPRs'.

9. Subsequently, on 03.08.2011, MoEF had accorded its Specific Decision, categorically holding that it had considered the revision in Project parameters occurred in the course of revising the Project generation capacity while transferring the EC in the name of AHPCL in the year 2006 and as such, the ECs' accorded to the Project are in line with the law of the land. While the MoEF was yet to grant the Specific Decision, the Appellant had filed an SLP being SLP No. 15423 of 2011 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, contending that the Uttarakhand High Court had not given him an opportunity to be a part in the process of issuing Specific Decision. While the said SLP was under adjudication, the MoEF had issued its Specific Decision and thus the Hon'ble Supreme Court had dismissed the SLP being SLP No. 15423 of 2011 as infructuous.

10 Further subsequently, the Appellant herein had challenged the Specific Decision before the Hon'ble High Court of Uttarakhand through a Writ Petition being W.P.No. 68 of 2011. In the said petition, the Appellant had challenged the legality of the Specific Decision with a plea that the MoEF had not conducted any public hearing prior to approving/ratifying the ECs' it had accorded to the Project. The Hon'ble High Court had upheld the contentions of the Appellant herein and directed the MoEF to conduct public hearing in accordance with law prescribed under EIA Notification of the year 1999 and as per the amendments carried to it in the year 2004. Aggrieved by the said orders, AHPCL had preferred an appeal before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No. 6736 of 2013 (originally the SLP No. 362 of 2012). Ultimately, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had given finality to the issue through its judgement dated 13.08.2013 wherein, the Hon'ble Apex Court had categorically held that the EC and other approvals given by the statutory bodies including the MoEF are legal and valid. Copis of the Judgements in the WP No. 137 of 2009 and W.P. No. 68 of 2011, copies of petition and orders in SLP No. 15423 of 2011: and copy of judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 13.08.2013 in CA No. 6736 of 2013 are enclosed.

11 It may be pertinent to mention at this juncture that the basis for Appellant's challenge in the above mentioned cases was DPRs' and what he challenged in those cases was the Project parameters and the approvals given against the said parameters. It may kindly be appreciated that the Appellant has sought the Respondent to provide copies of the same DPRs' based on which he had contested the above referred matters. In his letter dated 17.09.2013 (which is on record), referring to his original letter dated 07.06.2013; the Appellant has categorically stated the purpose in asking for the copies of DPRs' as "...It is further submitted that the information must be disclosed in the overreaching public interest. Affected people have the right to know what is the approved capacity, design and nature of the project especially in view of the disaster in Uttarakhand in June 2013." Thus, the purpose for which the information sought was unequivocally clear. It may kindly be appreciated that a plain reading of the narration on litigation submitted hereinabove and a plain reading of the above referred annexures would luminously make it clear that the Appellant has the copies of DPRs' in his possession and that he once again sought copies of the same from the Respondent. As such, what transpires out of this present Appeal is that the Appellant is seeking the

information which is already in his possession.

.....

15. It may kindly be noted from the sequence of events and facts stated above, the purpose stated by the Appellant in its application before the Respondent had been fulfilled (i) when the Hon'ble Courts have upheld the Project parameters like its design and structure, with the help of DPRs'; (ii) when the Hon'ble Supreme Court had considered the public interest involved in the operation of hydro power projects; and (ii) especially when the information sought from the Respondent is already available with the Appellant. Therefore, the purpose for which the information was sought by the Appellant got frustrated and as such, there cannot be any overreaching impact on the public interest if in case the present Appeal is dismissed, as pleaded by the Appellant.

15. The Commission sought to know the views of appellant as against the written submissions placed by the intervener. Ld. Counsel for appellant doesn't dispute the broad factual matrix as averred by the third party intervener.

16. A hydro electric project exploits natural resources and thus, the citizenry has a right to know. Since it affects the public in more than one way, there should be no reason to circumvent the public gaze thereby assessing its merits & demerits. It is essential that development should not be made at the cost of ecological equilibrium. Such developmental activities must attract attention of an informed citizenry enabling it to voice its opinion and thus, the right to know regarding the environmental impact, change in demographics and measures to secure social justice to the displaced/ affected should be unfettered. The decisions of Apex Court, Uttarakhand High Court and National Green Tribunal have given a quietus to the projects in question after taking into account the aforesaid factors of public interest. The information contained in Executive summary of DPR of a project reflects much more than what a reasonably prudent citizen would wish to know. Thus, I do not find involvement of any 'public interest' which warrants any further disclosure relating to DPR of respective projects.

17. The Ld. Counsel further contends that many of the developers have voluntarily disclosed their respective DPRs over their websites. She argues that such an act in furtherance of transparency is imitable by all the hydro project developers thereby strengthening public participation & vigil. Taking a strong objection to the aforesaid contention the 3rd party interveners state the aforesaid disclosure to be voluntary and non- obligatory. In the considered view of Commission, the noble desire of the appellant would not cut ice in the present factual premise.

18. No other point was argued by either party before the Commission.

19. In CIC/SS/A/2014/000338-YA; wherein the respondent THDC is the project developer itself, the request of appellant for disclosure of the entire DPR of Vishnugad-Pipalkoti project is rejected being exempted u/s Section 8(1)(d). However, the Commission is apprised that the Executive Summary (Environmental study) for aforesaid project can be accessed at <http://thdc.gov.in/writereaddata/english/pdf/ExecSumm- ENG.pdf>.

20. In wake of the discussion in the preceding paragraphs, the CPIO, CEA is directed to furnish Executive Summaries & TEC as sought in respective appeals bearing no. CIC/SS/A/2014/000197-YA, CIC/SS/A/2014/000198-YA, CIC/SS/A/2014/000212-YA. Information shall be furnished free of cost within 2 weeks of receipt of this order. The appeals are allowed in part.

(Yashovardhan Azad) Information Commissioner Authenticated true copy. Additional copies of orders shall be supplied against application and payment of the charges prescribed under the Act to the CPIO of this Commission.

(R.P. Grover) Designated Officer to IC (YA) Copy to:-

Central Public Information Officer under RTI First Appellate Authority under RTI Under Secretary-(P) & CPIO, Secretary - (CEA), Central Electricity Authority, Central Electricity Authority, PAC Directorate, Sewa Bhawan, PAC Directorate, Sewa Bhawan, R. K. Puram, New Delhi-110066. R. K. Puram, New Delhi-110066.

Shri Bharat Jhunjhunwala Lakshmoli, Post Office - Maletha, Via - Kirti Nagar, District - Tehri Garhwal-249161 (Uttarakhand).