

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

Decision No. CIC/SG/A/2010/000213/7131
Appeal No. CIC/SG/A/2010/000213

Relevant Facts emerging from the Appeal:

Appellant : Mr. Satyaprakash Rathi
RZ-72, Laxmi Park, Gopal Nagar,
Najafgarh, New Delhi – 110073.

Respondent : Mr. R. K. Dabral
Public Information Officer & Dy. Secretary
Govt. of NCT of Delhi
Delhi Subordinate Services Selection
Board, FC-18, Institutional Area, Karkardooma,
Delhi – 92.

RTI application filed on : 02/06/2009
PIO replied : 18/08/2009
First appeal filed on : 10/08/2009
First Appellate Authority order : 12/10/2009
Second Appeal filed on : 12/01/2010
Second Appeal received on : 22/01/2010
Hearing Notice sent on : 09/02/2010
Hearing held on : 12/03/2010

Information Sought:

- a) Number of vacancy for Ex-Servicemen for the post of Asstt. Teacher/ Teacher (Primary) under post code No. 164-165/2007 and details of post on which Ex-Servicemen was appointed.
- b) Number of vacant post under the above said post code No. 164-165/2007.

Reply of the PIO:

(PIO's reply received after filing First Appeal)

As per requisition of the Dte. Of Edn and MCD, the Board had advertised vacancies for the post of Asstt. Teachers/Teacher (Primary in the Dte. of Edn. and MCD vide its advertisement No. 07/07 and 08/07 under post code 164/07 and 165/07 respectively. Under post code 164/07 no vacancy was intimated as earmarked for EXSM category whereas under post code 165/07 the vacancies intimated as per requisition were 475 which were subsequently re distributed and increased to 707 vide MCD letter dated 07/02/2008. Under post code 165/07 the total selection in EXSM category was 25 only. Remaining vacancies earmarked for EXSM category could not be filled as suitable candidate meeting the eligibility criterion as fixed by RRs notified on 13/07/2007 and obtaining marks above the minimum marks 35% fixed for selection were not available.

Ground of First Appeal:

Non-receipt of information from the PIO within the stipulated time.

First Appellate Authority ordered:

The FAA in its order stated that the Appellant had received the information and was satisfied with it. However the Appellant had complained about the delay in receipt of information. The FAA condoned the delay.

Ground of the Second Appeal:

Delay in receipt of information from the PIO.

Relevant Facts emerging during Hearing:

The following were present:

Appellant : Absent;

Respondent : Mr. R. K. Dabral, Public Information Officer & Dy. Secretary;

The Respondent shows that the RTI application of the Appellant was sent by post on 02/06/2009 and he has sent the information by post to the Appellant on 03/07/2009. The information appears to be appropriate since the appellant has not stated any reasons for dissatisfaction with the information provided to him.

Decision:

The Appeal is dismissed.

The information appears to 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
12 March 2010

(In any correspondence on this decision, mention the complete decision number.)(G1)