

<b>RTI APPEAL DETAILS</b>			
<b>RTI Appeal Registration No. :</b>	CSLTD/A/E/25/00004	<b>RTI Appeal Received Date :</b>	16/09/2025
<b>RTI Request Registration No. :</b>	CSLTD/R/E/25/00052	<b>RTI Request Registration Date :</b>	07/08/2025
<b>Name :</b>		<b>Gender :</b>	
<b>Address :</b>			
<b>Pin Code :</b>			
<b>State :</b>		<b>Country :</b>	India
<b>Phone :</b>	Details not provided	<b>Mobile No. :</b>	Details not provided
<b>Email :</b>			
<b>Status :</b>	Rural	<b>Educational Status :</b>	
<b>Citizenship :</b>	Indian	<b>Is Appellant below poverty line ? :</b>	No
<b>CPIO of Public Authority Approached :</b>	27505	<b>CPIO's Order/Decision Date :</b>	Details not provided
<b>CPIO's Order/Decision No. :</b>	Details not provided		
<b>Ground For Appeal :</b>	Provided Incomplete,Misleading or False Information		
<b>Text of RTI First Appeal :</b>	The detailed grounds of appeal and relief sought are provided in the Supporting document attached herewith.		

**To**

The First Appellate Authority (RTI Act 2005)  
Cochin Shipyard Ltd.  
Ernakulam – 682015

Date: 16<sup>th</sup> September 2025

**Sub:** First Appeal under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005 against RTI Reply on  
Recruitment of Executive Trainee (Mechanical) at CSL

**Ref:** My RTI Application dated 05/08/2025, and reply No. CSUSEC/CS/CORRESP/  
RTI/2024/7 dated 11/09/2025 of the CPIO

---

**Grounds of Appeal****1. Query 1(i)(a) (Marks of candidates in written test, GD, writing skill test, and interview)**

- The PIO denied disclosure citing Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, treating marks of non-appointed candidates as “personal information.”
- This is contrary to law and settled precedents.
  - Supreme Court – *CBSE v. Aditya Bandopadhyay* (2011) 8 SCC 497: Marks are not exempt under Sec. 8(1)(j).
  - Delhi High Court – *UPSC v. Angesh Kumar* (2013): Marks of both selected and non-selected candidates must be disclosed after recruitment.
  - CIC precedents: Repeatedly held that marks of all candidates in public recruitment are disclosable in the larger public interest of transparency.
- Hence, the denial is legally unsustainable, and the requested marks must be disclosed.

**2. Query 1(i)(b) (Copies of answer sheets of candidates in writing skill test)**

- The PIO denied disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act 2005.
- However, recruitment examinations are conducted in the public domain and evaluated answer sheets are not “personal information”:
  - SC – *Aditya Bandopadhyay*: Answer sheets are information under RTI, not exempt under 8(1)(j) or 8(1)(e).
  - CIC – *Shailendra Kumar Singh v. PIO, EPFO (2018)*: CIC directed disclosure of other candidates’ answer sheets in a promotion exam, holding privacy exemption under 8(1)(j) inapplicable.
  - HC – *Kewal Singh Gautam v. State of Chhattisgarh* (AIR 2011 Chh 143): Evaluated answer sheets in public recruitments are not private information.
- In the present case, out of about 140 candidates attended the phase II selection process, only copies of 16 answer sheets are sought. This is reasonable and not burdensome, unlike large-scale exams such as UPSC or CBSE.

- Larger public interest in ensuring fair and transparent evaluation/selection process justifies disclosure.
3. **Query 1(i)(c)**
- The reply is satisfactory. No appeal is pressed.
4. **Query 1(i)(d) (Scheme of evaluation of writing skill test)**
- The PIO merely replied that the test was for 10 marks (two questions of 5 marks each, 30 minutes).
  - This is not the “scheme of evaluation” (i.e., the detailed criteria for awarding marks, such as clarity, grammar, structure, presentation, etc.).
  - The reply is thus incomplete and evasive.
5. **Query 1(i)(e) (Copy of specific instructions given to candidates for writing skill test)**
- The PIO gave only marks/duration, but not the instructions regarding word length, presentation style, etc., if any, as asked.
  - If such instructions were given, a copy must be disclosed. If none exist, the same should be stated clearly.
6. **Other Queries**
- The reply is satisfactory. No appeal is pressed.

---

### **Relief Sought**

1. Kindly direct the PIO to provide the marks of all candidates (query 1(i)(a)).
  2. Kindly direct the PIO to provide copies of answer sheets of the 16 candidates requested (query 1(i)(b)).
  3. Kindly direct the PIO to provide the actual scheme of evaluation (query 1(i)(d)) or a categorical statement that none was used.
  4. Kindly direct the PIO to provide a copy of the actual instructions (query 1(i)(e)), or a categorical statement that no such instruction were issued.
  5. Any other directions necessary in the interest of transparency and justice.
-



CSL/SEC/CS/CORRESP/RTI/2021/8

October 15, 2025

**Sub: Appeal Under Right to Information Act, 2005**

Dear Madam,

1. Please refer your Appeal No. CSLTD/A/E/25/00004 dated September 16, 2025. The said Appeal, your RTI request (ref no. CSLTD/R/E/25/00052 dated August 07, 2025), CSL's reply (ref no. CSL/SEC/CS/CORRESP/RTI/2024/7 dated September 11, 2025) and other relevant documents have been examined.
2. In your RTI request referred above you have inter alia sought for the marks scored by 16 candidates, copies of their answer sheets, scheme of evaluation for the writing skill answer sheets, specific instructions regarding the length in words and mode of presentation for the writing skill examination etc.
3. Cochin Shipyard Limited (CSL) vide its reply referred above had provided the marks secured by all the selected candidates and informed that the marks secured by the non-selected candidates and also copies of answer sheets of candidates are personal information related to a third party, the disclosure of which would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the individual and is also not warranted in the larger public interest. Hence the same is exempt from disclosure pursuant to Section 8(1)(j) of the Right to Information Act, 2005. Further w.r.t your request for information regarding the scheme of evaluation for the writing skill answer sheets and specific instructions regarding the length in words and mode of presentation for the writing skill examination, CSL vide its reply referred above had informed that the Writing Skills test was conducted for a total of 10 marks (30 minutes duration) comprising of two descriptive type questions of 5 marks each.
4. In your RTI Appeal referred above, you have submitted that the marks and answer sheets of candidates do not constitute personal information and should therefore be disclosed. You have also cited certain judicial precedents in support of this contention. However, upon careful examination of the cited case laws, it is observed that they are not applicable to the present matter. The judgments in those cases primarily pertain to the right of the examinee to access their own marks and answer sheets, and in one instance, relate specifically to departmental promotion examinations. In the instant case, you are not a candidate in the selection process. Further, CSL has also provided the marks of all selected candidates.

5. In this regard, attention is drawn towards a judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the matter of *Central Public Information Officer, Supreme Court of India Vs. Subhash Chandra Agarwal* in Civil Appeal No. 10044 of 2010 with Civil Appeal No. 10045 of 2010 and Civil Appeal No. 2683 of 2010, while explaining the import of "personal information" envisaged under Section 8(1)(j) of RTI Act, the Court observed that:

*"59. Reading of the aforesaid judicial precedents, in our opinion, would indicate that personal records, including name, address, physical, mental and psychological status, marks obtained, grades and answer sheets, are all treated as personal information. Similarly, professional records, including qualification, performance, evaluation reports, ACRs, disciplinary proceedings, etc. are all personal information. Medical records, treatment, choice of medicine, list of hospitals and doctors visited, findings recorded, including that of the family members, information relating to assets, liabilities, income tax returns, details of investments, lending and borrowing, etc. are personal information. Such personal information is entitled to protection from unwarranted invasion of privacy and conditional access is available when stipulation of larger public interest is satisfied. This list is indicative and not exhaustive."*

6. The above position has been upheld by the Central Information Commission in the matter of *Cochin Shipyard Limited Vs. Remshij M*, vide Order No. CIC/CSLTD/A/2021/607865 dated April 04, 2021.

7. Further, w.r.t your request for information regarding the scheme of evaluation (i.e., criteria for awarding marks) for the writing skill answer sheets and mode of presentation of the idea given to the candidates for the writing skill examination, this Authority, on perusal of the relevant documents, is of the opinion that CSL vide its reply referred above has provided all the information available in this regard and no further information is available for disclosure.

8. Further, w.r.t your request for information regarding specific instructions regarding the length in words given to the candidates for the writing skill examination, this Authority, upon perusal of the sample format of the writing skills examination question paper, could see that the maximum length of the answer for each question (5 marks X 2 questions) is prescribed as 150 words. No further information in this regard is available for disclosure.

9. With this, the first appeal stands disposed off.

Digitally signed by  
VALIYAPARAMBIL JACOB JOSE  
Date: 2025.10.15 18:39:13 +05'30'

**Jose V J**

Director (Finance) &  
First Appellate Authority