पावर ग्रिड कोर्पोरशन ऑफ इंडिया लिमिटेड

Power Grid Corporation of India Limited सूचना का अधिकार अभिनियम 2005 के अंतर्गत अपीलीय अधिकारी

Appellate Authority under the RTI Act, 2005

केन्द्रीय कार्यालय, 'सौदामिनी', प्लाट नं.2, सैक्टर-29, गुडगांव, हरियाणा-122007

Corporate Centre, 'Saudamini', Plot No. 2, Sector-29, Gurgaon, Haryana-122007

Ref: C/CP/AA/RTI Act, 2005

Date: 13th February, 2015

Appellant: Shri Ajay Singh

C/o Sardar Sunder Singh

General Merchant Store, Dhalli Bazaar, Tehsil- Chandpur

Bijnor District, Pin-246725

Appeal letter dated: 11th December 2014

Public Authority: Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd., Corporate Centre, Gurgaon.

Respondents: 1. General Manager (CP) & CPIO, Corporate Centre, POWERGRID, Gurgaon.

2. General Manager (HR), Corporate Centre, POWERGRID, Gurgaon

## ORDER

## **Grounds of Appeal**

The Appellate Authority, Corporate Centre, POWERGRID received an appeal dated 11<sup>th</sup> December 2014 from Shri Ajay Singh, under RTI Act, 2005. Earlier, an application dated 6<sup>th</sup> June, 2014 was filed by the Applicant with the CPIO, Corporate Centre under RTI Act, 2005 to obtain following information:

• Internal approvals taken by POWERGRID while furnishing information to Ms. Juhi Arora and Mr. Ajay Singh against their RTI requests dated 4<sup>th</sup> May 2013 and 13<sup>th</sup> October, 2013 respectively.

Details of leave and monthly absentee slip of Mr. Ankur Bhandari for the period of 1<sup>st</sup> January, 2006 to 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2012 and leave details of Ms. Shyama Kumari for the period of 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2005 to 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2008.

• DPC proceedings for promotion of E7, E8 and E5 in the year 2014.

• List of employees at E5 level who were due for promotion in 2014 with details of promotion drop till level of E4 grade.

On receipt of the appeal, comments/opinion of the CPIO, Corporate Centre and General Manager (HR) were heard and relevant papers perused. CPIO stated that based on the communication from HR department, information was provided to the applicant vide letter dated 31<sup>st</sup> July 2014. However, the applicant vide letter dated 31<sup>st</sup> October, 2014 addressed to Under Secretary, (PG desk), Ministry of Power with a copy endorsed to the CPIO informed that he had not received the information. Therefore, the information was once again

forwarded to the applicant vide letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> November, 2014. Presently, in the appeal, Appellant stated that:

- Annexures of the letter dated 31<sup>st</sup> July 2014 were not received.
- There must have been some period during which the attendance used to be marked on papers before the period of implementation of online attendance and provide those documents.
- DPC proceedings for year 2014 were not provided.
- List of employees (other than those joined POWERGRID as ETs) who were due for promotion to E5 level in 2014 along with details of their promotion drop till the level of E4.
- List of employees (those joined POWERGRID as ETs) who were due for promotion to E5 level in 2014 along with details of their promotion drop till the level of E4.

While hearing the matter, CPIO stated that the information provided to the Appellant was complete with all annexures and the statement given by the Appellant is not correct. Further, the Appellant had earlier (letter dated 13<sup>th</sup> May, 2014) also sought same information on the RTI requests received from Ms. Juhi Arora and Mr. Ajay Singh and vide order dated 2<sup>nd</sup> September, 2014, the Appellant was informed that no approval was taken by the CPIO while furnishing the information to them and even advised for inspection of concerned documents. However, the Appellant did not turn up for inspection.

Regarding the leave details of Mr. Ankur Bhandari and Ms. Shyama Kumari, the same was already furnished to the Appellant. Regarding the attendance/absentee slips, the information sought is in the nature of personal information of employee and there is no larger public interest warrants its disclosure. In fact the disclosure of it would lead to unnecessary invasion of privacy of employees as an individual and therefore exempted from disclosure. Accordingly, as per provision of Clause 8.1(j), the same cannot be disclosed.

Regarding CPC/CSC proceeding, General Manager (HR) stated that CPC proceedings are confidential in nature and contains information like appraisal ratings, character, capability and other attributes of the official reported upon etc., disclosure of which to a third person would lead to unwarranted invasion of privacy of the employee as an individual. Further, as per the CIC order dated 15<sup>th</sup> July, 2013 in the case of Shri H.K. Bansal vs. BSNL (No. CIC/BS/C/2013/000091) DPC proceedings regarding third party need not be disclosed. Therefore, the same was not disclosed to the Appellant in line with the clause 8(1) (j) of RTI Act, 2005.

Regarding list of employees who were due for promotion to E5 level in the year 2014 and their details of drops in promotions, General Manager (HR) stated that such information is not being prepared for the purpose of consideration for promotion during CPC. As per the CIC decision dated 20<sup>th</sup> September 2006 (No.CIC/MA/A/2006/00653) "CPIO of any public authority is not expected to create and generate information because it has been sought by an appellant". Further, the information as to whether the employees are ET batch or not, etc., are part of the evaluation sheets, contained in the DPC proceedings, which is not to be disclosed as explained above.

## Decision:

After going through the appeal and the submissions made by the CPIO, HR department, and from the CIC orders referred as above, I am of the opinion that there is enough justification for considering the information sought by the appellant is personal information related to third party and there is no larger public interest involved in disclosure of the personal information. Considering the above, I am inclined to agree with the submission of the CPIO and GM (HR) that the information sought need not be disclosed, as every citizen has the right to secure their privacy.

It is also evident from the record that CPIO had twice forwarded the part of the information sought to the Appellant, therefore the statement of Appellant that he had not received the annexures thereon is not tenable.

The appeal is accordingly disposed off.

Yours sincerely,

**Appellate Authority** 

To: Shri Ajay Singh,

C/o Sardar Sunder Singh General Merchant Store

Dhalli Bazaar, Tehsil- Chandpur District Bijnor, Pin-246725

Copy to: General Manager (HR), Corporate Centre, POWERGRID, Gurgaon

General Manager (CP) & CPIO, Corporate Centre, POWERGRID, Gurgaon