Ref: C/CP/AA/RTI Act, 2005                              Date: 13th February, 2015

Appellant: Shri Prem Shankar Nagar
E-171, Ram Nagar Extension
Sodala, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

Appeal letter dated: 3rd January 2014

Public Authority: Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd., Corporate Centre, Gurgaon.

Respondents: 1. General Manager (CP) & CPIO, Corporate Centre, POWERGRID, Gurgaon.
2. General Manager (HR), Corporate Centre, POWERGRID, Gurgaon

ORDER

The Appellate Authority, Corporate Centre, POWERGRID has received an appeal dated 3rd January 2014 (received on 7th January, 2015) from Shri Prem Shankar Nagar, under RTI Act, 2005. Earlier, an application dated 15th October 2014 was filed by the Appellant with the CPIO, Corporate Centre under RTI Act, 2005 to obtain following information:

- Promotion policy for the executives from E6 to E9 cadres since 1996, updated till 2014.
- Procedure of moderation of Annual Appraisal Reports, if applicable, for promotion from E6 to E9.
- Proceedings of all Corporate Promotion Committees constituted for consideration of promotion.
- Copy of evaluation sheet for the evaluation done by all Corporate Promotion Committees from 1st April, 1996 to till date.

On receipt of the appeal, comments/opinion of the CPIO, Corporate Centre and General Manager (HR) were heard and relevant papers perused. CPIO stated that based on the communication from HR department, information which could be disclosed under the provisions of the RTI Act, 2005 was provided to the applicant vide letter dated 19th November 2014.

While hearing the appeal by the Appellate Authority, CPIO stated that the applicant had sought information on DPC Proceedings, Annual Appraisal Policy, Promotions orders, etc.
Policy related to promotion had already provided to the Appellant. Since, information sought was for a period of about 18 years (promotion orders, list of candidates considered for promotion since 1996), applicant was advised for inspection of documents pertaining to specific individuals/particular year, otherwise compilation such old records for a period of 18 years would disproportionately divert the limited resources of the public authority. However, the Appellant did not turn up for inspection of documents.

Regarding CPC/CSC proceeding, since it contain information about the character, capability and other attributes of the officials reported upon, disclosure of which to any other person amounts to cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the individual, the same were not disclosed as per clause 8(1) (e) and (j) of RTI Act, 2005. Regarding CPC/CSC proceeding, General Manager (HR) further stated that CPC proceedings are confidential in nature and contains information like appraisal ratings, etc. Since the Appellant is a third party and has not title to obtain copy of the CPC/CSC proceedings. General Manager (HR) also informed that as per the CIC order dated 15th July, 2013 in the case of Shri H.K. Bansal vs. BSNL (File No. CIC/BS/C/2013/000091) DPC proceedings regarding third party need not be disclosed. GM (HR) also informed that as per judgment of Hon’ble Delhi High Court dated 8th July, 2014, DPC proceedings can only be disclosed to concerned employees and not to any other individuals. Accordingly, the as per provision of Clause 8.1(j), the same need not be disclosed.

**Decision:** On going through the appeal and explanation given by the CPIO and GM (HR), it is noted that the information which can be shared under the provisions of RTI Act, 2005 have already been furnished to the Appellant. Regarding CPC proceeding, it is clarified by CPIO and GM (HR) that same need not be disclosed to third parties. I am of the opinion that there is enough justification for CPC proceedings not to be disclosed to a third party, and I am inclined to agree with the submission of the CPIO and GM (HR) on non-disclosure of the same. I also tend to agree with the CPIO’s view of offering inspection of documents specific to particular individuals as the information sought was too old and for a period of about 18 years. It is also noted that the Appellant did not turn up for inspection of documents.

Therefore, I agree with the considered opinion of CPIO and GM (HR) to withhold the information sought by the appellant under Sec-8(1) (j) of the RTI Act, 2005 as there is no public interest involved in disclosure of information.

The appeal is accordingly disposed off.

Yours sincerely,

Appellate Authority

To: Shri Prem Shankar Nagar  
E-171 Ram Nagar Extension 
Sodala, Jaipur, Rajasthan

Copy to: General Manager (HR), Corporate Centre, POWERGRID, Gurgaon  
General Manager (CP) & CPIO, Corporate Centre, POWERGRID, Gurgaon