

केन्द्रीय सूचना आयोग
Central Information Commission
बाबागंगनाथमार्ग, मुनिरका
Baba Gangnath Marg, Munirka
नईदिल्ली, New Delhi - 110067



द्वितीय अपील संख्या / Second Appeal No. **CIC/DSPCE/A/2020/115182**

Shri S Suresh Kumar

... अपीलकर्ता / Appellant

VERSUS/बनाम

PIO

...प्रतिवादीगण / Respondent

Department of Space, Liquid Propulsion Systems
Centre, Thiruvanthapuram

Date of Hearing : 15.03.2022

Date of Decision : 21.03.2022

Chief Information Commissioner : Shri Y. K. Sinha

Relevant facts emerging from appeal:

RTI application filed on : 04.11.2019
PIO replied on : 25.11.2019
First Appeal filed on : 06.12.2020
First Appellate Order on : 22.01.2020
2ndAppeal/complaint dated : 28.05.2020

Information sought and background of the case:

The Appellant filed an RTI application dated 04.11.2019 and the CPIO, Liquid Propulsion Systems Centre vide letter dated 25.11.2019 replied as under:-

Query No.	Information sought for	Reply/Comments
1	Criteria adopted by judges in the evaluation of the painting competition held in connection with World Space Week at St. Joseph HSS, Trivandrum on 6 th October, 2019.	Justice to the topic : 40% Creativity : 30% Colour Composition : 20% Overall visual appeal : 10%
2	Criteria wise breakup of marks secured by each participant in the painting competition (Junior level) held in connection with World Space Week at St. Joseph HSS, Trivandrum on 6 th October, 2019.	Details of Prize Winners in the competition are : 1. Aleena AP - First Prize 2. Anjana Sugunan - Second Prize 3. Revathy V Lal - Third Prize

Dissatisfied with the response received from the CPIO, the Appellant filed a First Appeal dated 06.12.2020. The FAA/Controller, Department of Space vide order dated 22.01.2020 stated as under:-

2. On examination of the application, reply furnished to the applicant by CPIO and appeal, I am of the opinion that it is appropriate to inform the appellant whether any information on point No.2 is held by the Public Authority under Section 2(f) of RTI Act, 2005. If held, the same may be disseminated to him within 15 days of receipt of this order. The appeal is decided accordingly.

In Compliance with the FAA's order dated 22.01.2020, the CPIO, Liquid Propulsion Systems Centre, D/o Spacevide letter dated 27.01.2020 replied as under:-

PS

APIO
31.3.22

PS
4/4/22

Based on the criteria given by the Committee constituted for the purpose and the general appreciation of the paintings, the judges, who are experts in the field and external to ISRO, decided the winners through three levels of selection for each of the categories (Junior & Senior). After preliminary and secondary screening, 13 contestants were selected for the final round. From the 13 contestants, the judges selected the first, second and third ranks for each of the categories. The remaining 10 were selected for consolation prize. Since the judges did not assign any marks to the participants, the breakup marks of the participants, who had participated in the Painting Competition, is not held by the Public Authority.

Feeling aggrieved and dissatisfied, the Appellant approached the Commission with the instant Second Appeal.

Facts emerging in Course of Hearing:

A written submission has been received from the CPIO, Liquid Propulsion Systems Centre, D/o Space vide letter dated 11.03.2022 and the same has been taken on record.

The Appellant participated in the hearing through video conference. He stated that satisfactory information has not been provided to him as the marks assigned to his daughter in the painting competition held on 06.10.2019 have not been communicated to him.

The Respondent represented by Shri M Prasanan, CPIO and Head, PGA, Liquid Propulsion Systems Centre, Thiruvananthapuram participated in the hearing through video conference. He stated that complete information as per available record was provided to the Appellant in compliance with the FAA's order wherein it was mentioned that the judges did not assign any marks to the participants hence the break up of marks of the participants who had participated in the painting competition is not held by the public authority.

Decision:

Keeping in view the facts of the case and the submissions made by both the parties, the Commission is of the view that an appropriate response as per the provisions of the RTI Act, 2005 has been provided by the Respondent. Hence, no further intervention of the Commission is required in the instant matter. For redressal of his grievance, the Appellant is advised to approach an appropriate forum.

With the above observation, the instant Second Appeal stands disposed off accordingly.

Sd/-

Y. K. Sinha (वाई. के. सिन्हा)

Chief Information Commissioner (मुख्य सूचना आयुक्त)

Authenticated true copy

(अभिप्रमाणित सत्यप्रति प्रति)

S. K. Chitkara (एस. के. चिटकारा)

Dy. Registrar (उप-पंजीयक)

011-26186535

Copy to:

The PIO
Department of Space
Liquid Propulsion Systems Centre
Valiamaia PO
Thiruvanthapuram - 695547

Shri S Suresh Kumar
K-170A, Kochar Road,
Sasthamangalam P.O
Thiruvananthapuram - 695010

