

Central Information Commission, New Delhi
File No.CIC/SM/C/2013/000286
Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (19)

Date of hearing : **24/07/2013**

Date of decision : **24/07/2013**

Name of the Appellant : **Sh. Ashish Ranjan,**
R/o House No. E-10, 1st Floor, Nehru Vihar,
Delhi - 110054

Name of the Public Authority : **Central Public Information Officer,**
Staff Selection Commission,
Sh. Gopinath Nayak, C1/1 Section, Blcok No.
12, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi

The Appellant was present.

On behalf of the Respondent, Shri Gopinath Nayak, US was present.

Chief Information Commissioner : **Shri Satyananda Mishra**

2. We heard both the parties.

3. In respect of the recruitment for the post of Stenographer Grade C and D held 1/5 October 2012, the Appellant had sought several information including the copies of the passages which had been dictated and his own evaluated transcript. When he did not receive any reply from the CPIO, he had approached the Appellate Authority. He did not receive any response from the Appellate Authority either. Consequently, he has approached the CIC. It seems, after he filed the second appeal, the CPIO provided him with some information.

4. The Appellant submitted that the information which was provided to him by the CPIO was not complete. He explained that he had to take the examination on two different dates namely, on 1 and 5 October 2012 because

of some technical glitch on the first date resulting in the erasure of some text he had typed. The authorities had therefore allowed him to take the test on 5 October. While the CPIO had provided him with the dictation passages and his evaluated transcript for the 5 October 2012 test, he had not provided him the dictation passages of the examination held on 1 October. He also submitted that the CPIO had not clarified if his final results were based on his performance on the first date of the examination or on the second date.

5. After carefully considering the facts of the case, we tend to agree with the demands of the Appellant. He must be provided with the remaining information without any further delay. Since the SSC had allowed him to take the examination once again, he has every right to know if the final results were based on his performance on the last test or on the first one. Therefore, we direct the CPIO to revisit the records and provide the following information to him within 10 working days of receiving this order:

- i. the attested photocopy of the dictation passages for the examination held on 1 October 2012;
- ii. the attested photocopy of his evaluated transcript/answer sheet on the basis of which his final results had been announced by the SSC.
- iii. the certified statement of results including marks prepared by the examiner, whether manual or digital, in respect the Appellant.

6. About the delay in this case, the CPIO concerned submitted that it was not deliberate and was due to the fact that the authorities were in the process of examining the transcripts once again in view of many complaints received from the candidates and, thus, the transcripts could not be disclosed at that time. If that were so, the CPIO should, at least, have informed the Appellant in time

about that instead of not responding at all for months. Although, we are not imposing any penalty on him but we would like to advise him very strongly to be careful in future in meeting the strict deadlines fixed under the Right to Information (RTI) Act.

7. The appeal is disposed off accordingly.
8. Copies of this order be given free of cost to the parties.

(Satyananda Mishra)
Chief 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.

(Vijay Bhalla)
Deputy Registrar