Relevant Facts emerging from the Appeal.

Appellant: Mr. Debashish Dutta  
Scientific Officer D  
Physics Group  
Van de Graff Building, BARC  
Trombay, Mumbai - 400085

Respondent: Mr. S. Govardhan Rao  
PIO & Head (Personnel)  
Central Complex, 3rd Floor  
Bhabha Atomic Research Center (BARC)  
Trombay, Mumbai - 400085

HTI application filed on: 14/06/2011  
PIO replied: 08/07/2011  
First appeal filed on: NOT ENCLOSED  
First Appellate Authority order: 06/09/2011  
Second Appeal received on: 16/11/2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Information Sought</th>
<th>Reply of the PIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Considering factor(s) in favour of sanctioning the project with undersigned scientific officer as principal collaborator.</td>
<td>This project was given to you as you are having graduate degree in Mechanical Engineering. You were replaced as project coordinator expecting that you would be able to shoulder responsibility commensurate to your grade. Since you did not show progress in this project, you were replaced as project coordinator with another senior mechanical engineer to expedite the project work by vide letter No. HWD/A-42/1557 dated November 19, 1997.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Whether or not any factor(s) in favour of aforesaid replacement, Discipline of engineering, if any of the head spearheading the nomination that materialized the replacement (vide HWD/A-42/1557 dt. Nov.19/20,1977) with his service status serving/retd. If retired, pension holder or expired grade pay at which pension is drawn. If the replacement procedure favours cryoless qualified mechanical engineers at the cost of time and money of cryo specialized qualified mechanical engineers, even if the specialization is from an IIT.</td>
<td>This is not a requirement for assignment of work as project coordinator. The competent authority, Head, Heavy Water Division had the authority of.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>If the replacing officer acquired any higher degree subsequent to joining service, whether the study for the degree was sponsored in service or GATE score based scholarship funded and the institute awarding the degree and the name of the specialization. If GATE score based, year of the same requested with discipline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>If the member secretary, I&amp;SC, BRNS to whom the letter regarding replacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This page contains a document with text that is not legible due to the image quality. The text appears to be discussing project management and authorization, possibly related to the Indian Navy's (INS) project approvals. The document seems to be discussing issues related to the INS's Bahadurkhan Sagar Barrage Project and the implications of decisions made regarding the project's authorization and progress.
Grounds for the First Appeal:
Incomplete and unsatisfactory information provided by the PIO.

Order of the First Appellate Authority (FAA)
It is found that the information sought by appellant has already been provided by the PIO, BARC in adequate manner within the prescribed time limit. Acceptance of the grounds/reasons for arriving at certain decisions by the Appellant is not covered by RTI Act. The PIO has furnished information as applicable under the Act. The Appellant may note that RTI Act is not a platform to redress his grievances, real or imaginary, regarding his transfer/postings/career progression. FAA upholds the information given by PIO.

Grounds for the Second Appeal:
Incomplete and unsatisfactory information provided by the PIO unfair disposal of the appeal by the FAA.

Relevant Facts emerging during Hearing:
The following were present
Appellant: Mr. Debashish Dutta on video conference from NIC-Mumbai Studio;
Respondent: Mr. S. Govindan, Rao, PIO & Head (Personnel Division) on video conference from BARC Studio;

The Commission has identified that this matter also been listed as case no. CIC/SG/2011/00339 which has been listed for hearing on 24/01/2012. Hence this matter was also disposed of this.

The Appellant appears to have been given information available as per records. He is seeking reasons for his being replaced in a particular project. The PIO states that apart from the letters given to the Appellant, there are no reasons on the records.

Decision:
The Appeal is disposed.

The reasons available on the records 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
20 January 2012

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