

**CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION**

2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, August Kranti Bhawan,  
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066

**Decision No. CIC/SB/A/2015/000095**

**Dated 21.09.2016**

**Appellant** : Ms. Anita Yadav,  
H.No.10/B, Ananda,  
Super City, Bareilly, U.P.-243 006.

**Respondent** : Central Public Information Officer,  
Staff Selection Commission,  
21 – 23, Lowther Road,  
Allahabad-211 002.

**Date of Hearing** : 21.09.2016

**Relevant dates emerging from the appeal:**

RTI application filed on : 05.01.2015

CPIO's reply : 29.04.2015

First appeal filed on : 16.05.2015

FAA's order : 12.06.2015

Second appeal filed on : 28.06.2015

**ORDER**

**1.** Ms. Anita Yadav filed an application dated 05.01.2015 under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) before the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO), Staff Selection Commission (SSC) seeking information on two points regarding the list of reserve candidates for the post of Lower Divisional Clerk (LDC) which was sent to Employees' Provident Fund Organization (EPFO) in the year of 2003.

---

2. The appellant filed a second appeal dated 28.06.2015 before the Commission on the grounds that she is not satisfied with the information provided to her.

**Hearing:**

3. The appellant Ms. Anita Yadav was not present despite notice. The respondent Shri V.M. Shukla, Dy. Director, SSC attended the hearing through video conferencing.

4. The respondent submitted that the SSC (Central Registry) office was shifted in 2012 to its present location and the file concerned might have been misplaced during the shifting. The respondent further submitted that the appellant was informed vide letter dated 29.04.2015 that despite best efforts, the relevant file was not traceable in the respondent office. The respondent also stated that the appellant was also advised that the required information may be obtained from the EPFO, the Cadre Controlling Authority who are the custodian of the dossiers of the nominated candidates along with the list.

**Decision:**

5. The Commission, after hearing the respondent and perusing the records, agrees with the respondent that since the relevant file is not traceable, the information sought cannot be provided to the appellant. Hence, no further intervention of the Commission is required in the matter.

6. With the above observations, the appeal is disposed of.

7. Copy of the decision be provided free of cost to the parties.

**(Sudhir Bhargava)**  
**Information Commissioner**

**Authenticated true copy**

**(V.K. Sharma)**  
**Designated Officer**