

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

2nd Floor, August Kranti Bhawan,
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066

Decision No. CIC/SB/C/2015/000019

Dated 21.09.2016

- Complainant** : Dr. S.K. Prasad,
Convener, AIMS F,
A-137, Sector-31,
Noida,
Uttar Pradesh-201303.
- Respondent** : Central Public Information Officer,
Union Public Service Commission,
Dholpur House,
Shahjahan Road,
New Delhi-110069.
- Date of Hearing** : 21.09.2016

ORDER

1. Dr. S.K. Prasad had submitted a representation dated 24.06.2015 to the Central Information Commission (CIC) regarding malpractices, irregularities and favoritism during interview held on 01.06.2015-05.06.2015 for 20 posts (10-UR, 06-OBC, 01-ST & 03-SC) of Specialist Grade III Assistant Professor (Obstetrics & Gynecology) in the Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Central Health Service, Teaching Specialist Sub-Cadre, Group 'A'.

2. The complainant submitted that it is prima - facie evident that the declared results are extremely biased and unfair and that interview results should be cancelled and the eligible candidates should be re-interviewed by a new panel as soon as possible. The complainant sought the Commission's urgent intervention in the matter, so that justice may be done to all eligible candidates.

Hearing:

3. The complainant Dr. S.K. Prasad was not present despite notice. The respondent Shri Sunil Kumar, Under Secretary, UPSC was present in person.

4. The respondent submitted that the appellant had filed RTI application on 30.06.2015 enclosing a copy of his representation dated 22.06.2015 regarding malpractices, irregularities and favoritism during interview of Specialist Grade III Assistant Professor (Obstetrics & Gynecology) in the Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Central Health Service, Teaching Specialist Sub-Cadre, Group 'A'. The respondent further submitted that a reply to the appellant's RTI application dated 30.06.2015 was sent on 27.07.2015.

Decision:

5. The Commission, after hearing the submissions of the respondent and perusing the records, observes that the complainant had addressed his representation dated 24.06.2015 to the then Chief Information Commissioner in which no information has been sought. The Commission further observes that the representation is neither a complaint filed under Section 18 of the RTI Act nor a second appeal filed under Section 19 of the RTI Act. The same has apparently been registered as a complaint by the Central Registry of the CIC inadvertently. Hence, no intervention of the Commission is required in the matter.

6. With the above observations, the matter is disposed of.
7. Copy of decision be given free of cost to the parties.

(Sudhir Bhargava)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(V.K. Sharma)
Designated Officer