

Central Information Commission, New Delhi
File No.CIC/SM/A/2011/001509
Right to Information Act-2005-Under Section (19)

Date of hearing : **30 July 2012**

Date of decision : **30 July 2012**

Name of the Appellant : **Shri Upendra Narayan Lal Das,
Village Dharmpati, Post Jiyaram
Radhopur, Distt – Supol,
Bihar – 852 111.**

Name of the Public Authority : **CPIO, Staff Selection Commission,
Block No. 12, Kendriya Karyalaya Parisar,
Lodhi Road, New Delhi.**

The Appellant was present.

On behalf of the Respondent, Shri Satya Prakash, US was present.

Chief Information Commissioner : **Shri Satyananda Mishra**

The Appellant was present in the Supaul studio of the NIC. The Respondent was present in our chamber. We heard both their submissions.

2. The Appellant had wanted to know about the method of computing the age of a candidate appearing in the Combined Graduate-level Examination, in this case, one held in 2008. Since the candidate had been found over age by the SSC, he was curious to know how that candidate was issued the admit card for the main examination. Besides, he had also wanted to know about the

marks awarded to that candidate in that examination. The CPIO had informed him about the method adopted by the SSC in computing the age of the candidate. The Appellate Authority had endorsed the information provided by the CPIO.

3. During the hearing, the Appellant cited several other examples to show that the SSC computed the age of candidates differently and argued that declaring the candidate over age in this particular case was absolutely wrong. Besides, he also complained that since the said candidate had been allowed to take the papers, he had a right to know about the marks awarded to him.

4. After carefully considering the submissions made before us, we are of the view that the SSC owes it to that candidate to explain why he was allowed to take the examination if he was overage to begin with unless, of course, it was a common practice with the SSC to allow over age candidates to take examinations only to declare them unfit later. Besides, he should also be provided with the marks awarded to that candidate. We direct the CPIO to write to the Appellant within 10 working days of receiving this order informing him on both the counts.

5. The appeal is disposed off accordingly.

6. 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