CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
Club Building (Near Post Office)
Old JNU Campus, New Delhi - 110067
Tel: +91-11-26161796

Decision No. CIC/SG/A/2011/902693/16682
Appeal No. CIC/SG/A/2011/902693

Relevant Facts emerging from the Appeal

Appellant	:	Mr. Akash Munnalal Saraf SO/C, CDM, BARC, Trombay Mumbai -400085
Respondent	:	Mr. Goverdhan Rao, Central Public Information Officer & Head Personnel Division **BARC** C/O HPD, 3rd Floor, CC Traombay , Mumbai -85

RTI application filed on	:	05/07/2011
PIO replied	:	02/08/2011
First appeal filed on	:	04/08/2011
First Appellate Authority order	:	Not enclosed
Second Appeal received on	:	20/09/2011

Information Sought:

A. Certified copy of additional qualification details in annexure –III (TO circular No. TC/1 (52) / 89/2011/35452 dated April 20, 2011 submitted by all the divisions /units of BARC.
B. Certified copies of an approved list of candidates of BARC eligible to appear for the DQE –TO -2011 on 30/07/2011.
C. certified copies of the list of candidates not eligible for appearing in the DQE –TO-2011 based on the information furnished by the division concerned along with the reasons for rejection.
D. Certified copy of further information /decisions about certain cases with TC as per the circular ref no. TC/1(52) 89/2011/55415 June 22, 2011.
E. Certified copies of circular ref TC/1(52)/89/2010 /72511 dated Aug 4, 2010.

Reply of the PIO:

Some parts of the CPIO reply are enclosed. Information denied regarding queries B and c under section 8 (1) (J) of the RTI Act.
Information related to query d was also denied under section 8 (1) (e) of RTI Act
Information regarding query B is displayed on BTS. Information related to query E was provided.

Grounds for the First Appeal:

Information provided is unsatisfactory.

Order of the FAA:

Not enclosed.

Grounds for the Second Appeal:

Information provided is unsatisfactory and CPIO's interpretation of the section 8 needs to be reviewed.

Relevant Facts emerging during Hearing:

The following were present:

Appellant: Absent;

Respondent: Mr. Goverdhan Rao, Central Public Information Officer & Head on video conference from NIC-Mumbai Studio;

The Appellant has sent a letter to the Commission admitting that he has received information after the order of the First Appellate Authority on 13/09/2011. He is complaining about the following information:

1- The Appellant claims that certified photocopies of the certificates of additional qualifications were not given to him. The PIO contends that this was not sought in the original RTI application. He states that he has sent the certified list of the additional qualifications of all the applicants.

Decision:

The Appeal is disposed.

The information sought by the Appellant appears to have been provided.

This decision is announced in open chamber.
Notice of this decision be given free of cost to the parties.
Any information in compliance with this Order will be provided free of cost as per Section 7(6) of RTI Act.

Shailesh Gandhi
Information Commissioner
30 December 2011

(In any correspondence on this decision, mention the complete decision number.) (PG)