

B hCENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
2nd Floor, 'B' Wing, August Kranti Bhawan,
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi -110066
Tel : +91-11-26186535

Appeal No. CIC/YA/A/2016/002346

Appellant: Sh. Subhrangsu Kumar
B-3, Malyagiri,
Anushakti Nagar, Mumbai
Maharashtra-400094.
Maharashtra

Respondent: Central Public Information Officer
Deptt. Of Atomic Energy, Water &
Steam Chemistry Divn., BARC
Facilities, Kalpakkam-603102

Date of Hearing: 08.08.2017

Dated of Decision: 08.08.2017

ORDER

Facts:

1. The appellant filed RTI application dated 30.07.2015 seeking copy of all the pages of APAR of both Sh. T. Alaguvadivel & Smt. Sushma Alaguvadivel for the year 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012; Copy of their representations, if any, given to head, PRPD or Facility Director, BARCF, Kalpakkam or any other higher authority of BARC, Mumbai since 2013 till date.
2. The CPIO responded on 01.09.2015. The appellant filed First Appeal dated 03.10.2015 with First Appellate Authority (FAA). The FAA responded on 30.10.2015. The appellant filed second appeal on 27.06.2016 before the Commission on the ground that information should be provided to him.

Hearing:

3. The appellant and respondent Mr. S. Ranganathan, Chief Administrative Officer participated in the hearing through video conferencing.

4. The appellant stated that he was the Reviewing Officer and had given his remarks on the APARS of Sh. T. Alaguvadivel & Smt. Sushma Alaguvadivel's for the year 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012. The appellant further stated that to defend his case in the court, he needs his own papers.

5. The respondent stated that the information sought is personal in nature. The grading done by him was not final. The respondent further stated that the appellant was a Reviewing Officer and his grading was subject to final grading by the head of the division concerned. The respondent said that the same matter was heard in the Commission on 17.02.2017 in appeal No.CIC/YA/A/2016/001132.

6. The respondent stated that the information sought by him is third party information u/Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, therefore they have denied the same.

Discussion/ observation:

7. The information sought by the appellant is of individual interest. The information sought by the appellant is third party information.

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