

14

No: A/63/MIC - 2025
MANIPUR INFORMATION COMMISSION
SECRETARIAT NORTH BLOCK, GROUND FLOOR,
BEHIND WESTERN BLOCK,
IMPHAL, MANIPUR.
Phone No: 0385-2456495



Appeal Case No. 63 of 2025

H. Merina Devi

- Appellant

-Vs-

SPIO/ Addl. Director (GC), Directorate of Education (S), Manipur & - Respondents

DECISION

Dated 28.07.2025

The FAA and the SPIO are represented by Shri Karong Victor Kom, OSD (Legal). The Appellant is also present.

Background:

The Appellant, Huidrom Merina Devi, filed an RTI application dated 07.10.2024 under Section 6(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, seeking information related to the recruitment of 413 Multi-Tasking Staff (MTS) on a regular basis under the Department of Education (S), Manipur, as notified vide Notification No. AO/252/MTS/2016(5)-DE(S) Pt-1 dated 24.09.2024. The application sought:

- (i) Marks of all selected candidates in Un-Reserved and OBC (M) categories.
- (ii) Marks of candidates on the waiting list in Un-Reserved and OBC (M) categories.
- (iii) Marks of candidates at the top of the merit list in Un-Reserved and OBC (M) categories.
- (iv) Marks of candidates at the lowest rank of the merit list in Un-Reserved and OBC (M) categories.
- (v) Marks obtained by the Appellant (Roll No. 14876) in the written test.
- (vi) Copy of the Appellant's answer paper (Roll No. 14876).
- (vii) Answer key of the written examination. The State Public Information Officer (SPIO) responded on 13.02.2025, providing information for queries (v) and (vi) but denying queries (i) to (iv) under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, citing invasion of privacy and lack of larger public interest. Query (vii) was denied for being "not specific." The Appellant filed a First Appeal on 22.11.2024, which remained unresolved, leading to the present Second Appeal filed on 09.05.2025.

During the appeal proceedings, the SPIO provided:

- (a) A list of selected candidates in Un-Reserved and OBC (M) categories with their marks (query i) on 23.06.2025, but without roll numbers.
- (b) The answer keys for the written examination for MTS Booklet Series A, B, C, and D (query vii) on 23.06.2025, though not duly certified, as noted during the hearing on 19.06.2025.

In a rejoinder dated 10.07.2025, the Appellant sought additional information beyond the original RTI application, specifically:

- (a) List of selected candidates in the Un-Reserved category with their respective roll numbers.
- (b) Answer papers of the 207 selected candidates in the Un-Reserved category as listed in the letter dated 23.06.2025.

Hearing and Submissions:

During the hearing today i.e. 28.07.2025, the SPIO's representative, Shri Karong Victor Kom, OSD (Legal), submitted additional information dated 24.07.2025, which included the marks of candidates on the waiting list, at the top and bottom of the merit list in Un-Reserved and OBC (M) categories (queries ii, iii, and iv). He also submitted that the left out information including the answer keys for MTS Booklet Series A, B, C, and D (query vii) had already been provided to the Appellant. The SPIO also provided the list of selected candidates in the Un-Reserved category with their respective roll numbers, addressing the additional request (a) from the rejoinder dated 10.07.2025, despite it being outside the original RTI application.

The SPIO argued that the additional request (b) for the answer papers of the 207 selected candidates in the Un-Reserved category is not maintainable, as it falls outside the original RTI application and involves third-party personal information under Section 8(1)(j). The SPIO cited the Hon'ble Supreme Court's judgment in Public Information Officer and Registrar & Anr. v. Onkar Dattatray Kalmanakar & Anr. (Special Leave to Appeal (C) No. 2783/2025, dated 07.02.2025), which specifies that only marks of selected candidates are disclosable in the public interest, not their answer papers or OMR sheets. The SPIO further contended that providing such information would cause an unwarranted invasion of privacy and serve no larger public interest, being driven by the Appellant's self-vested interest.

After hearing the clarification from the representative of the SPIO, the Appellant submitted that she is satisfied with the information provided in respect of all queries (i) to (vii) of the original RTI application and the additional request (a) from the rejoinder. The Appellant agreed to close the appeal proceedings, expressing no further intent to pursue the request for the answer papers of the 207 selected candidates (rejoinder request b).

Findings and Justification:

1. Status of Original RTI Queries:

All queries from the original RTI application dated 07.10.2024 have been addressed:

- (a) Query (i): Marks of all selected candidates in Un-Reserved and OBC (M) categories were provided on 23.06.2025.
- (b) Queries (ii), (iii), and (iv): Marks of candidates on the waiting list, at the top, and at the lowest rank of the merit list in Un-Reserved and OBC (M) categories were provided on 24.07.2025.
- (c) Query (v): Marks of the Appellant (Roll No. 14876) were provided on 13.02.2025.
- (d) Query (vi): Copy of the Appellant's answer paper (Roll No. 14876) was provided on 13.02.2025.



- (e) Query (vii): Answer keys for MTS Booklet Series A, B, C, and D were provided on 23.06.2025, and a duly certified copy was furnished on 23.06.2025.

2. Additional Information Sought in Rejoinder:

The rejoinder dated 10.07.2025 introduced two new requests:

Request (a): List of selected candidates in the Un-Reserved category with their respective roll numbers, which was provided by the SPIO on 24.07.2025, despite being outside the original RTI application.

Request (b): Answer papers of the 207 selected candidates in the Un-Reserved category, which remains pending.

3. Justification for Disclosure of Original Queries and Rejoinder Request (a):

(a) Transparency in Recruitment Process: The disclosure of marks and answer keys ensures transparency in public recruitment processes, as held in *CBSE v. Aditya Bandopadhyay* (2011) 8 SCC 497, which mandates that details of competitive examinations, including marks and answer keys, are disclosable under the RTI Act. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Public Information Officer and Registrar & Anr. v. Onkar Dattatray Kalmanakar & Anr.* (Special Leave to Appeal (C) No. 2783/2025, dated 07.02.2025) further clarified that "the disclosure of the marks though may fall in the category of personal information, yet the disclosure of this personal information is presently necessary in public interest, and therefore, it is not an information which cannot be given by the Information Officer under the RTI Act, 2005. To the contrary, such an information must be disclosed in order to maintain transparency in the process." This precedent supports the disclosure of queries (i) to (iv).

(b) Rejoinder Request (a): Although the request for roll numbers was not part of the original RTI application, the SPIO voluntarily provided this information on 24.07.2025, and the Appellant expressed satisfaction with it.

4. Reasons for Rejection of Rejoinder Request (b):

The request for answer papers of the 207 selected candidates in the Un-Reserved category is rejected for the following reasons:

(a) Beyond Scope of Original RTI Application: The RTI Act, under Section 6(1), requires that requests for information be specific and part of the initial application. The request for answer papers of 207 candidates was not included in the original RTI application dated 07.10.2024, which only sought the Appellant's own answer paper. The Central Information Commission in *CIC v. State of Gujarat* (2013) held that new information requests cannot be entertained in appeals unless they are clarifications of the original application. This request is a new query, not a clarification.

(b) Privacy Concerns: Providing answer papers of 207 candidates involves personal information protected under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Girish Ramchandra Deshpande v. CIC* (2013) 1 SCC 212 held that personal information, such as examination



answer sheets of third parties, is exempt unless a larger public interest is demonstrated. The Onkar Dattatray Kalmanakar judgment (supra) explicitly limits disclosure to marks of selected candidates, stating that original answer papers or OMR sheets are not covered under the public interest mandate. The Appellant has not demonstrated a larger public interest beyond personal verification, which does not outweigh the privacy rights of other candidates.

5. Appellant's Satisfaction and Closure Request:

After hearing the clarification from the SPIO's representative, the Appellant submitted that she is satisfied with the information provided in respect of all queries (i) to (vii) of the original RTI application and the additional request (a) from the rejoinder. The Appellant agreed to close the appeal proceedings, indicating no further intent to pursue the request for the answer papers of the 207 selected candidates (rejoinder request b). Given the Appellant's satisfaction and explicit agreement to close the proceedings, the Commission deems it appropriate to dispose of the appeal, subject to the rejection of the remaining request (b).

Decision:

The appeal case is disposed of, as all queries from the original RTI application dated 07.10.2024 (i to vii) and the additional request (a) from the rejoinder dated 10.07.2025 have been satisfactorily addressed, and the additional request (b) is rejected for the reasons stated above. No further action is required.

Announced in the open chamber.

Typed by: -

Compared by: -



(K. Radhashyam Singh)
State Chief Information Commissioner,
Manipur Information Commission.

Authenticated by

S. Inao Singh
28/07/2025

(S. Inao Singh)
Deputy Registrar (Judicial -I)
Manipur Information Commission

Copy to: -

1. The FAA/ Director, Education (S), Manipur.
2. The SPIO/ Addl. Director (GC), Directorate of Education (S), Manipur.
3. Huidrom Merina Devi, Chingamathak, Manipur College Road.
P.O. Imphal, P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West
Contact No. 7005606906/ 8258851208
- ✓ 4. The Joint Secretary (MIC), Manipur – *He is requested to upload it on the official website.*

Note: - For online hearing, he/she is requested to download the *Jitsi Meet* app for use on a mobile phone or use the link <https://meet.jit.si/MIC1> for video conference (VC) on computer and enter the room name as **MIC1**.