**GOVERNMENT OF INDIA**

**MINISTRY OF RAIWLOAYS**

**(RAILWAY BOARD)**

No. RB/RTI/2011/18021/CPIO-31 (Final Reply) New Delhi, Dated:- 13/09/2011

Sh. S.K. Bansal

B-3/4, Jeevan Jyoti Apartment

Near Lok Vihar

Pitampura

Delhi-110 034.

**Sub: Information sought under Right to Information Act, 2005.**

Ref: Your letter received in this office on 28/07/2011.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Kindly refer to your letter which was received in this office on 28/07/2011, seeking information under the Right to Information Act, 2005.

The requisite information as received from the Directorate (s) concerned is enclosed.

However, in case you are not satisfied with the information, you may prefer an appeal within 30 days as provided in the Act to the Appellate Authority, EDE(GC), Railway Board, Rail Bhawan, Raisina Road, New Delhi-110001.

( B. MAJUMDAR)

CPIO-31 & Dir.E(GP)

Railway Board

Ph.No. 23383630

DA: As above.

**No: RTI/2011/010018021**

Sub: Information sought by Shri S.K. Bansal.

Ref: Case No. RB/RTI Cell/2010/010018021 seeking information

under the RTI Act.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S.No. | Item No(s) | Information sought by the Party | Ministry’s response (reply text) | Annexure (Certificate No. detailed file noting) |
| 1 | 1  3  4  5 | Whether in the event of review of DPCs, the system of creating supernumerary posts is being adopted by the Railway Ministry every time.  If not, why this system has been adopted while reviewing the DPCs of Traffic Deptt. DPC for the year 2005-2006?  Whether by adopting this system, the number of vacancies for N.Rly which were fixed earlier (perhaps 18) were increased by 3 Nos.  If so, whether this is the normal system of doing the DPCs. If not what system was being used earlier to this, and after this DPC for traffic and other department DPCs. | **Item 1,3,4 & 5**  Information sought has already been furnished in reply to items (ii) to (xii) of the initial application, vide letter No. RTI Cell/2009/01005399. |  |
| 2 | 2 | If so, in which DPCs belonging to Traffic or other departments this system was adopted during last 15 years. | **I**t would not be possible to furnish the information in the form in which it has been sought, in terms of the RTI Act, 2005, as it would disproportionately divert the resources of the public authority. |  |
| 3 | 6 | Whether the same system was adopted while reviewing the DPCs 1994 to 2000 in terms of Supreme Court’s judgment for S&T Deptt if not, the reasons thereof and if yes, furnish the details of supernumerary posts thus created. | As already mentioned in the reply vide letter No. RTI Cell/2009/ 01005399, limited review of DPC is necessitated due to change in feeder grade seniority. In the case of S&T department, there was no question of change in feeder grade seniority. The situation, therefore, did not call for any limited review |  |
| 4 | 7 | If the normal system of downgrading the junior most person to next year’s panel, would have been adopted in the Traffic Deptt. case mentioned above, what are the names of 3 junior most officers, who would have been downgraded to next year panel. | Information sought is hypothetical and does not come under purview of the RTI Act. |  |

( Prabir Roy)

Deputy Director, Estt.(GP)-I

Railway Board