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

Decision No. CIC/SG/A/2012/000081/18310
Appeal No. CIC/SG/A/2012/000081

Relevant facts emerging from the Appeal:

Appellant	:	Mr. Vikas K. Telang SO/F, Reactor Engineering Division, BARC, Mumbai,
Respondent	:	Mr. N. G. Krishnan, PIO & Dy. Establishment Officer **Bhaba Atomic Research Center** Central Complex, 3rd Floor, BARC, Trombay, Mumbai - 400085

RTI application filed on	:	21/11/2011
PIO replied on	:	05/12/2011
First Appeal filed on	:	09/12/2011
First Appellate Authority order of	:	23/12/2011
Second Appeal received on	:	29/12/2011

The information sought: Appellant wants to information list of names of officers promoted to Scientific Officer (G) during year 2011 (or candidates declared successful in promotion interview).

S. No.	Information sought	The PIO reply
1.	Please provide list of names of BARC officers including officers on deputation to BARC from other units like NPCIL with Engineering background, promoted to SO/G during year 2011 (or candidates declared successful in promotion interview) with following categorization: a. Candidates who were rejected in any of the past three promotion interviews i.e. from SO/C to SO/D, SO/D to SO/E, SO/E to SO/F on one single occasion. b. Candidates who were rejected in any of the past three promotion interviews i.e. from SO/C to SO/D, SO/D to SO/E, SO/E to SO/F on one two occasion. c. Candidates who were rejected in any of the past three promotion interviews i.e. from SO/C to SO/D, SO/D to SO/E, SO/E to SO/F on one multiple occasion. d. Rest all candidates may be clubbed in single table. • For each candidate, promo9tion history since date of joining DAE may kindly be furnished i.e. number of years in which promoted form SO/C to SO/D, SO/D to SO/E, SO/E to SO/F and SO/F to SO/G be specified. Failures in any of the promotion interviews including SO/F to SO/G need to be indicated. Please note that pay scales for SO/C and SO/SC, SO/D and SO/SD were different. Accordingly these grades should be accurately stated. • In case of candidates from training school betch may kindly be	A list of BARC officers who were promoted to the grade of Scientific Officer/G during the year 2011 is enclosed (3 pages). Other details are not being maintained in the form in which it is sought for. It would disproportionately divert the resources of the Public Authority to collate the information. Hence, exempt u/s. 9 of the RTI Act, 2005.

	specified. • In case of candidates who are not from training school and are recruited directly, same may kindly be indicated. • In case of non training school candidates, who did not have professional batchelor or Master degree in Engineering at the time of joining DAE, qualification at the time of joining may be specified (for example those who joined DAE after completing Diploma in Engineering and who subsequently did courses like AMIE. In case of such candidates, joining grade i.e. scientific officer/ Assistant may be clearly stated. Such candidates may kindly be listed separately. • In case of candidates who joined DAE as Scientific Assistants, a separate table may kindly be provided. • Name of Group to which a candidate belongs may kindly be specified e.g. RD&DG etc.	
2.	Name of Chairman, AEC and Director, BARC during year 2011 may kindly be stated.	Chairman, AEC – Dr. S. Banerjee. Director, BARC – Dr. R. K. Sinha

Grounds for the First Appeal:
The appellant was received an unsatisfactory reply from the PIO.

Order of the First Appellate Authority (FAA):
" And Whereas the undersigned as the Appellate Authority under RTI Act has called for the records related to this case from the Public Information Officer. The points raised by Shri Telang in his appeal dated 09-12-2011 have been examined and it is seen that, PIO, BARC has provided the information as available within the prescribed time limit. It seen from the application that, Shri Telang has requested form information indicating number of parameters and in the format prepared by him. A statement showing the details of officers with Engineering background, promoted as SO/G in the year 2011 and their career progression is enclosed."

Ground of the Second Appeal:
The applicant is not satisfied with the PIO reply and unsatisfactory order had passed by the First Appellate Authority.

Relevant Facts emerging during Hearing:
The following were present
Appellant: Mr. Vikas K. Telang on video conference from NIC-Mumbai Studio;
Respondent: Mr. N. G. Krishnan, PIO & Dy. Establishment Officer on video convergence from BARC Studio;

The Appellant states that the PIO has provided a considerable amount of information but the Appellant wants to inspect the relevant records on 25 April 2012 from 10.30AM onwards at the office of the PIO.

The PIO is directed to facilitate an inspection of the relevant records by the Appellant on 25 April 2012 from 10.30AM onwards at the office of the PIO. In case there are any records or file which the appellant believes should exist, which are not shown to him, he will give this in writing to the PIO at the time of inspection and the PIO will either give the files/records or give it in writing that such files/records do not exist.

Decision:

The Appeal is allowed.

The PIO is directed to facilitate an inspection of the relevant records by the Appellant on 25 April 2012 from 10.30AM onwards. The PIO will give attested photocopies of records which the Appellant wants free of cost upto 100 pages.

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
09 April 2012

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