RTI APPEAL DETAILS			
RTI Appeal Registration No. :		RTI Appeal Received Date :	23/03/2023
RTI Request Registration No. :		RTI Request Registration Date :	19/02/2023
Name:	SUMAN SINGH	Gender:	Female
Address:	W/o Santosh Kumar Singh, Proprietor Arch Construct820/1 SAHADATPURA, NEAR JYOTI EYE HOSPITALMAU NATH BHANJAN		
Pin Code:	275101		
State:	Uttar Pradesh	Country:	India
Phone:	+91-9453927633	Mobile No :	+91-7675929267
Email:	golu2249@gmail.com		
Status :	Urban	<b>Educational Status:</b>	
Citizenship :	Indian	Is Appellant below poverty line?:	No
CPIO of Public Authority Approached:	20855	CPIO's Order/Decision Date :	Details not provided
CPIO's Order/Decision No. :	Details not provided		
Ground For Appeal :	Provided Incomplete, Misleading or False Information		
Text of RTI First Appeal :	1. A justification letter regarding payment to partnership firm had been asked by Powergrid Corporation of India from Santosh singh (proprietor Arch construction). Reply on above subject submitted by Santosh singh on 1st dec 2017(copy attached) and also received by powergrid vide powergrid receipt No 18816 dated 4th dec 2017. This justification is telling everything about partnership firm and single proprietor firm as well as tells Civil works (400/220kv shahjahanpur and sohawa substation) Was awarded to m/s Arch construction single proprietor Santosh Singh. But reply of RTI of registration no. PGCIL/R /E/23/00072 was given that civil work awarded from Powergrid to the partnership firm Arch construction I am not agree with RTI Reply which has been received from powergrid corporation of India. Please provide correct information and TIN no. of firm on the basis of valid documents only. 2. As per your RTI reply against my RTI, work was awarded to partnership firm Arch construction vide contract agreement 7th July 2014 and 23rd july 2014 but when I go through the contact agreement of 7th July 2014 i found that signature of Ajay singh as a witness on contract agreement whereas Ajay Singh was the partner of partnership firm Arch construction and if this work was awarded to partnership firm		

1 of 2

then why did all three partners not signed on this both contract agreement, how can be it possible that a partner signed an agreement as witness. It is clear that work was awarded to Arch construction, proprietor, Santosh Kumar Singh.I am not agree with RTI reply 3. As per your Powergrid RTI reply, civil work of 400/220 KV shahjahanpur and sohawal substation awarded to partnership firm and in this regard a partnership deed of of partnership arch construction was atteched in RTI reply to prove that work was Awarded to partnership firm Arch construction. I would like to say that deed is only document in which rules and regulations are made for the smooth functioning of a firm. It doesn't prove that work was awarded to above partnership firm... Next point arises if this deed made on 13th sept 2013 and deed registered as a partnership firm arch construction on 29th March 2014(copy enclosed) After completion of only 04 month of partnership firm arch construction. How can it possible that civil work 400/220 kV shahjahanpur and sohawal may be awarded to partnership firm Arch construction if it happens so please policy/notification as well as Qualifying benchmark may be provided in which, the eligibility is mentioned for taking the civil work from Powergrid. 4. Refer to both contract agreement dated 23.07.2014 and 07.07.2014, notification foreclosing letter dated 04.10.2017(enclosed) and justification letter dated 01.12.17 (copy enclosed) and various letter of Get Power mentioned in both contract agreement. It can certainly say that the work was awarded to that M/s Arch construction which was subcontractor of M/s Get Power Ltd which was proprietor

2 of 2 27-03-2023, 09:37