

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
2nd Floor, 'B' Wing, August Kranti Bhawan,
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi -110067
Tel : +91-11-26717355

Appeal No. CIC/RK/A/2016/001277

Appellant: Mr. Mohit Chaudhary
R/o. H No-1298, Sector-13, Urban Estate, Karnal-
132001, Haryana, (9896508596).

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer Registrar (Judl.),
Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur.

Date of Hearing: 17.10.2016
Dated of Decision: 17.10.2016

ORDER

Facts:

1. The appellant filed RTI application dated 11.01.2016 seeking information on 18 points regarding minutes of meetings and resolutions passed by the Recruitment Cell/Committee in charge of selection process in relation to the recruitment of Rajasthan Judicial Service, Civil Judge Cadre, 2015, Rajasthan Judicial Service Rules, criterion of selection, names of members of Interview Board etc.
2. The CPIO responded on 14.01.2016, 16.04.2016. The appellant filed first appeal on 08.03.2016 with the First Appellate Authority (FAA). The FAA response is not on record. The appellant filed second appeal on 27.04.2016 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.
4. The appellant stated that he has been provided information with regard to point no. 18 of the RTI application and rest of the information has not been provided to him. The appellant stated that he is not pressing for information with regard to point nos. 2, 9, 12 and 15. The appellant stated

that he has received the PIO and FAA reply after filing the second appeal. The appellant stated that he has not been provided the opportunity of hearing in the first appeal. The appellant stated that the information was denied on invalid exemptions.

5. The appellant stated that no rules are available on the website with regard to constituting two interview boards/panels and interchanging the members in the panels, random selection process of the candidate for interview. The appellant stated that he has not been provided Minutes of meeting, list of segregated marks given in the interview e.g. what weight/marks was given to LL.M, PHD, Gold Medallist, specific knowledge in a filed etc. The appellant stated that he has not been provided the pointwise information. The appellant stated that the respondent has taken different stand in the written submissions filed in the second appeal vis-a-vis reply given by PIO and FAA.

6. The appellant stated that the larger public interest is involved in the matter and therefore, the sought for information should be provided to him.

7. The respondent stated that the pointwise response was sent to the appellant vide letter dated 06.05.2016. The appellant stated that the decision on the appeal was taken vide order dated 21.05.2016 which was sent to appellant vide letter dated 28.05.2016.

8. The respondent stated that the photocopy of the answer book of Civil Judge Cadre Examination, 2015 has already been provided to the appellant and information on certain other points was also made available to the appellant.

9. The respondent stated the segregated marks of the applicant at Interview are not available on record with the Examination Cell. However, the final result with details of marks awarded to candidates against each paper and interview is available on the website www.hcraj.nic.in. The respondent stated that keeping in view of the transparency; the candidates were called for interview randomly through a computerised selection method.

10. The respondent stated that the information which could have been provided have been provided to the appellant. The respondent stated the information relating to selection/recruitment Committee is exempted under

section 8(1)(g) of the RTI Act in terms of the judgment Bihar Service Commission Vs. Saiyed Hussain Abbas Rizwi & Anr (2012) 13 SSC 61. The respondent stated that the information relating to Rajasthan Judicial Service Rules are available on the website.

Discussion/ observation:

11. The action/steps taken by the respondent in dealing with the RTI application is satisfactory. The information as available, which could have been provided, has been given.

Decision:

12. No action is required in the matter at the level of this Commission.

The appeal is disposed of. A 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