

**CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**2nd Floor, 'B' Wing, August Kranti Bhawan,**  
**Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi -110066**  
**Tel : +91-11-26717355**

**Appeal No. CIC/VS/A/2015/000760**

Appellant: Vishavnath  
Loco Colony Pathardihy Distt. Dhanbad, Rly Qtr.  
167/C Jharkhand-828119

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer-IV  
Sr. DPO East Central Rly, DRM Office, POP/Distt.  
Dhanbad-826001, Jharkhand

Date of Hearing: 15.12.2016

Dated of Decision: 15.12.2016

**ORDER**

**Facts:**

1. The appellant filed RTI application dated 14.02.2014, 16.05.2014 seeking information as to why job was not offered to Shri Anil Prasad on his application dated 16.11.2010 sent along with other 13 candidates under LARSGESS scheme etc.

2. The CPIO responded on 10.06.2014, 04.06.2014. The appellant filed first appeal on 03.07.2014 with the First Appellate Authority (FAA). The FAA responded on 15.07.2014. The appellant filed appeal on 29.09.2014 before the Commission with the plea that the sought for information has not been provided to him.

**Hearing:**

3. The appellant and the respondent both participated in the hearing through video conferencing.

4. The appellant stated that he wanted to know as why his son has not been appointed under LARSGESS Scheme in terms of Railway Board Circular no. 166/2011.

5. The respondent stated that the appellant has been replied to vide letter dated 10.06.2014 citing that they had not received instruction with regard to

implementation of Railway Board Circular no. 166/2011 and no candidate with educational qualification of class 8<sup>th</sup> pass has been appointed. The respondent stated that appellant may approach competent authority for redressal of his grievances.

6. The respondent stated that the first appellate authority vide its order dated 15.07.2014 had disposed of the first appeal having concurred with the findings of the CPIO.

7. The appellant stated that he has filed a case in the Court of law.

**Discussion/ observation:**

8. The action/steps taken by the respondent in dealing with the RTI application is satisfactory.

**Decision:**

9. No further intervention of the Commission is required in the matter.

The appeal is disposed of. Copy of the order be given to the parties free of cost.

**(Radha Krishna Mathur)**  
**Chief Information Commissioner**

Authenticated true copy

(S.C. Sharma)  
Dy. Registrar