

**CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
CLUB BUILDING (NEAR POST OFFICE)
OLD JNU CAMPUS, NEW DELHI-110067**

**Decision No.CIC/DS/A/2013/002514/SB/
Appeal No.CIC/DS/A/2013/002514/SB**

Dated: 03-08-2015

Complainant: Ms. Punam Kumari,
Flat No. SF.I., House No. S-22,
Dayanand Park,
Shalimar Garden Extention.1,
Sahibabad
Ghaziabad , U.P.

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer,
Staff Selection Commission,
Block No.12, CGO Complex,
Lodhi Road, New Delhi.

Date of Hearing: **03 .08.2015**

ORDER

1. Ms. Punam Kumari filed a RTI application under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) on 05.08.2013 with the CPIO, S.S.C., New Delhi seeking information on the following four points relating to Combined Graduate Level Examination (CGL), 2010:

- i) Certified copy of OMR Sheet of Tier-I Examination.

- ii) Certified copy of OMR sheet of Paper II and Paper III of Tier-2 Examination.
- iii) Certified copy of her Data Entry Test Sheet.
- iv) Her total marks in CGL-2010 mentioned on SSC website was 384 and last selected candidate in Tax Assistant in CBDT & CBEC was 378 and she had also qualified in the Data Entry Test. Give reasons as recorded in the file for her non-selection for the post of Tax Assistant in CGL Exam-2010.

2. Since the appellant did not receive any reply from the CPIO she filed first appeal dated 16.09.2013 before the FAA. FAA vide Order dated 04.07.2013 directed the CPIO/U.S.(C.I/1) to provide the information sought by the appellant. As there was no reply from the CPIO despite the order of FAA, the appellant filed the present second appeal dated 25.10.2013 before the Commission.

Hearing:

3. Shri Shashi Bhushan, H/o Ms. Punam Kumar, representing the appellant and respondent Shri R. Thakur were present during the hearing.

4. The appellant submitted that she had filed a RTI application on 05.08.2013. However, she received the reply only on 22.10.2013 in compliance of the order of FAA dated 04.10.2013. The information was still incomplete as the reply did not give reasons for her non selection though she had obtained 384 marks as against 378 obtained by last selected candidate for the post of Tax Assistant in Combined Graduation Level Examination 2010.

5. The respondent submitted that the information sought in RTI was “reasons as recorded in the file for non selection for the post of Tax Assistant in Combined Graduation Level Examination 2010”. Since the result were processed on computer the reply provided to the appellant stated that the information is not maintained in file because the result is processed in computer.

Decision:

6. The Commission observes that the CPIO is expected to provide reply which is meaningful. Thus, the CPIO should have given the reasons for non selection of the applicant. The Commission

directs the CPIO to communicate the reason for non selection of the candidate by 10.08.2015. In case, the appellant does not receive or is still not satisfied with the information provided to him he can file a complaint with the Commission.

7. The appeal is disposed of. Copy of decision be given free of cost to the parties.

(Sudhir Bhargava)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy.

(V.K. Sharma)
Designated Officer