



पावर ग्रिड कोर्पोरेशन ऑफ इंडिया लिमिटेड
Power Grid Corporation of India Limited
सूचना का अधिकार अभिनियम 2005 के अंतर्गत केन्द्रीय लोक सूचना अधिकारी
Central Public Information Officer under the RTI Act, 2005
केन्द्रीय कार्यालय, 'सौदामिनी', प्लॉट नं. 2, सेक्टर-29, गुडगांव, हरियाणा-122007
Corporate Centre, 'Saudamini', Plot No. 2, Sector-29, Gurgaon, Haryana-122007



CP/RTI/2013/411

Date: 25th January, 2017

Smt. Ramabharti Sharma
C/o Shri P.K. Sharma, Engineer (CS)
Power Grid Corporation of India Limited
400/220 KV Kishenpur Sub Staion
via Dansal, Jammu
Jammu & Kashmir-181224


Sub: Information under Right to Information Act, 2005.

Dear Sir,

This has reference to CIC order no. CIC/YA/A/2015/902774 dated 26th December 2016 against your RTI request dated 01.04.2015 under RTI Act, 2005. The information as directed by the CIC is attached herewith as Annexure-I.

Thanking you,

भवदीय,


(अजय होलानी) 25/1

अपर महाप्रबंधक (के.आ.) एवं के.लो.सू.अधिकारी
Email ID: epio.cc@powergrid.co.in

The sealed cover i.r.o. Sh. PK Sharma for the year 2001 be opened and its contents disclosed to the appellant.

Reply. In this regard, it is stated that the DPC proceedings i.r.o. Sh. Sharma for the year 2001 that had been kept under sealed cover was opened and it is observed that the DPC 2001 found Sh. Sharma 'suitable' for promotion.

As per POWERGRID's HR Policy Manual, Section 7.3.3 (ii), "if any penalty is imposed as a result of the disciplinary proceeding or if he is found guilty in the criminal prosecution against him, the findings of the sealed cover shall not be considered. His case for promotion may be considered by the next CPC in the normal course and having regard to the penalty imposed on him.

The findings of the DPC proceeding for 2001 was kept in sealed Cover as there was vigilance proceeding pending and after the conclusion of said proceeding Sh. Sharma was finally awarded a minor penalty of 'Censure'. Since Sh. Sharma had been awarded a minor penalty his sealed Cover was not acted upon as per above mentioned policy.

A clear and cogent reply as to why the case of promotion of the appellant's husband was not placed before the successive DPCs.

Reply. In this regard, it is stated that according to the promotion policy at that time, for an employee to be called for interview for promotion to the E1 level, he/she had to pass the written test in the year in which he/she is being considered, irrespective of whether the employee has passed the written test in earlier years. Sh. Sharma was called to appear for the written test in each of the years following 2001.

Sh. Sharma passed the written test in the year 2002 and was called for an interview. The DPC, however, after looking at Sh. Sharma's AAR marks, grade service, educational qualifications and experience profile, did not find him suitable for promotion to E1 level and accordingly, he was not promoted.

He, however, did not pass the written test in the years 2003 and 2005 and did not appear for the written test in the years 2004 and 2006. Therefore, Sh. Sharma has been considered for promotion in all the years from 2001 to 2007 as he was requested to appear for the written test every year. Subsequently, when he passed the written test in the year 2007, his case was placed for consideration before the DPC and he was found suitable and promoted to E1 level.

Mayank
(Mayank Soni)
Officer (HR)