accept his or her application for information or appeal under this Act for forwarding the same to the Public Information Officer or senior officer specified in sub-section (1) of section 19 or the Information Commission;

(ii) who has been refused access to any information requested under the Act;

(iii) who has not been given a response to a request for information or access to information within the time limit specified under the Act;

(iv) who has been required to pay an amount of fee which he or she considers unreasonable;

(v) who believes that he or she has been given incomplete, misleading or false information under the Act; and

(vi) in respect of any other matter relating to requesting or obtaining access to records under the Act.

The Commission does not maintain a record of complaints before it.

(d) Appeal and Penalty provisions available in the RTI Act take care of RTI requests rejected malafidely.

List of various aspects of Under Secretary grade

†4558. SHRI SHIVANAND TIWARI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a selected list including the various aspects of the Under Secretary (US) grade was prepared in the year 2003;

(b) if so, whether the Supreme Court has considered and has given its ruling on 13th February, 2012 regarding the dispute that emerged about this list;

(c) if so, whether orders for the implementation of this decision have been issued; and

(d) if so, on which date and if not, the reasons for the delay?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): (a) Select List for the year 2003 in respect of the grade of Under Secretary of Central Secretariat Service was prepared in terms of then extant CSS Rules, 1962 and issued on 25.8.2009.

---

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.

(b) On an Original Application filed in the Central Administrative Tribunal (CAT), New Delhi challenging the aforesaid Select List, the Tribunal *vide* their order dated 9th May 2011 directed the Government to redraw the said Select List by considering such of the direct recruit Section Officers who may be short of eligibility service by up to two years.

A Special Leave Petition (SLP) was filed by the Department of Personnel and Training against said order dated 9th May 2011.

The SLP filed by the Government was dismissed by the Supreme Court *vide* their order dated 13.2.2012 on the ground that writ petitions challenging the said order of the Tribunal were already pending before High Court of Delhi.

(c) and (d) The matter is sub-judice.

Attending of calls in Government offices

4559. SHRI BHARAT SINH PRABHAT SINH PARMAR:
SHRI PARSHOTTAM KHODABHAI RUPALA:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) the action taken by Government on fact that in many Government offices, telephone allocated to officials are not attending the calls as caller ID has been installed and due to this lot of difficulties are being faced by public representative to approach Government officials on issues of people;

(b) the action taken by Government on the fact that official email of Members of Parliament are not responded by Government officials despite the fact that Government is moving for paperless work and computerization; and

(c) whether Government intends to issue any directives in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): (a) to (c) Detailed instructions have been issued by DoPT *vide* O.M. No. 11013/4/2011-Estt. (A) dated 01.12.2011 is given in Statement (*See* below) regarding observance of proper procedure in official dealings between Administration and Members of Parliament/ State Legislatures after consultation with the Privilege Committee of the Lok Sabha, Sub-para (xii) of para 5 of the O.M. stipulates that officers should not ignore telephonic messages left for them by Members of Parliament/State Legislatures in their absence and should try to contact at the earliest the Members concerned.