

पावर ग्रिड कारपोरेशन ऑफ इंडिया लिमिटेड
POWER GRID CORPORATION OF INDIA LIMITED
सूचना का अधिकार अधिनियम 2005 के अंतर्गत आपीलीय अधिकारी
APPELLATE AUTHORITY UNDER THE RTI ACT, 2005
केन्द्रीय कार्यालय , सौदामिनी , प्लॉट नं.2, सैक्टर- 29, गुड़गांव ,
हरियाणा-122001
CORPORATE CENTRE, 'SAUDAMINI', PLOT No.2, SECTOR-29, GURGAON,
HARYANA- 122001

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

Date: 7th May, 2019

Appellant: Sh. Nikhil Patil, C/o Bina Rani Jha, Near Jama Masjid ,New Khajasarai Colony road, Darbhanga, Bihar, PIN - 846001

Public Authority: POWERGRID

Respondent: Sr. GM (CP) & CPIO, Corporate Centre, POWERGRID, Gurgaon.
ED (HR), Corporate Centre, POWERGRID, Gurgaon

ORDER

Grounds of Appeal

The Appellate Authority has received an online Appeal dated 8th April 2019 from Sh. Nikhil Patil. Earlier, the appellant herein had filed an on line RTI application bearing number PGCIL/R/2019/50118, dated 2nd March 2019, with the CPIO Corporate Centre, POWERGRID, under RTI Act, 2005, seeking information related to recruitment done for the post of Engineer (Telecom) against Advertisement No. CC/05/2018 dated 09.05.2018. The instant appeal is on the ground that CPIO has given information with respect to only 31 candidates whereas 40 candidates were called for the interview. Further, the appellant has also sought information related to marks of written test, of all the candidates who were called for interview.


On receipt of the appeal, relevant papers and information provided by the CPIO vide its letter dated 26th March, 2019 were perused.

Decision:

I have perused the information provided by the CPIO vide letter dated 26.03.19. It can be seen that vide aforementioned letter list of candidates (category wise) who appeared and qualified the interview, was provided to the appellant. However, as per appellant total 40(forty) candidates including the appellant were called for the interview, and the list provided vide letter dated 26.03.19 only mentions 31 candidates. Be as it may, if 40 (forty) candidates were called for the interview then the CPIO should have provided the complete list of interviewees who were called for interview along with their interview marks as per the request of the appellant. Therefore, in my opinion the appellant should be provided with the complete list of interviewees who were called for interview.

The appellant has also asked for written test marks of all the candidates who were called for interview. I have been informed that the written test was conducted for the purpose of screening and restricting the number of candidates to be called for interview, and no weightage was given to the marks obtained in the written test. The appellant has already been provided category wise cut off marks (written test) required for appearing in the interview. I am of the opinion that disclosure of marks of all the candidates who appeared in the written test is not required as it would not serve any public purpose. However, in case the appellant has not been made aware of his marks of the written test, the same should be intimated to him forthwith.

The Appeal is accordingly disposed of.


(Sanjeev Singh)
ED (CMG) & Appellate Authority

To: Sh. Nikhil Patil, C/o Bina Rani Jha, Near Jama Masjid ,New Khajasarai Colony road, Darbhanga, Bihar, PIN - 846001

Copy to: (i) Sr. GM (CP) & CPIO, Corporate Centre, POWERGRID, Gurgaon.
(ii) ED (HR), Corporate Centre, POWERGRID, Gurgaon