(296)

Central Information Commission
Room No.307, II Floor, B Wing, August Kranti Bhawan, Bhikaji Cama Place,
New Delhi-110066
website-cic.gov.in

Appeal No. CIC/MP/A/2016/000231

Appellant	:	**Shri Ali Hussain, Bareilly**
Public Authority	:	**Indian Security Press, Nashik**
Date of Hearing	:	**15th June, 2016**
Date of Decision	:	**30th June, 2016**
Present		
Appellant	:	Present
Respondents	:	Shri Sudhakar Vasant Lokhande, Assistant Manager and Shri Om Prakash, Sr. Supervisor- through VC
RTI application	:	18.08.2015
CPIO's reply	:	01.09.2015
First appeal	:	29.10.2015
FAA's order	:	07.12.2015
Second appeal	:	15.12.2015
Information Commissioner	:	**Manjula Prasher**

भारत प्रतिभूति मुद्रणालय
INDIA SECURITY PRESS
28 JUL 2016
Dy. No. R-1204

ORDER

1. The appellant, Shri Ali Hussain, through his RTI application sought following information in respect of a stamp paper (of value four rupees and fifty naye paise), copy of which he had enclosed with the RTI application: (A) confirmation in writing that the said stamp paper was issued by the public authority in the year 1954; and (B) date of the issuance of the said stamp paper.

2. The CPIO informed the appellant that it was not possible for them to provide the requisite information in the absence of the original stamp paper, while mentioning that they carried out sovereign function regarding the examination/verification/genuineness/first date of printing etc. of security documents only on the requests of the Courts, CBI, police authorities/investigating agencies and not on the behest of private individuals. If

private parties wanted to have the security documents examined by them, they were required to forward the documents/stamps/stamp papers in original (and not copies thereof), only through Government departments/investigating agencies along with an examination fee of Rs. 100/- per document in advance by way of cash or demand draft in the name of the General Manager, India Security Press, Nashik Road. Dissatisfied, the appellant preferred an appeal before the First Appellate Authority (FAA), who upheld the CPIO's reply.

3. The appellant then came in appeal before the Commission seeking direction to the respondents to provide the information sought to him.

4. The matter was heard by the Commission. The appellant stated that he did not have the original copy of the stamp paper as the same had been submitted in court. The respondents stated that in the absence of the original stamp paper, it was not possible for them to confirm whether the stamp paper enclosed with the appellant's RTI application was printed in their press or not, while mentioning that although the stamp papers were printed in the public authority, these were issued by different authorities. They could not detect the date of printing of a stamp paper merely by seeing a photocopy of the same. They also cited security reasons for not sharing such information as the same may be misused if reached wrong hands. They reiterated that they carried out sovereign function regarding the examination/verification/genuineness/first date of printing etc. of security documents only on the requests of the courts, CBI, police authorities/investigating agencies and not on the behest of private individuals and that if private individuals wanted to have such security documents examined by them, they had to follow the prescribed procedure as mentioned in the CPIOs' reply to the appellant. While reacting to the appellant's statement that the stamp paper in question had been submitted in court, they advised that the appellant could move an application to the court, where said stamp paper was submitted, seeking examination thereof by them and in the event the court so directs, they could examine the authenticity of the said stamp paper.

5. The Commission observes that the respondents have apprised the appellant of the factual position, besides explaining to him the procedure for getting his concerns/reservations, which are the basis of seeking the present information, addressed. The appellant, if he so wishes, may follow the advice of the respondents. The appeal is disposed of.

Sd

(Manjula Prasher)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy:

Deputy Registrar

Address of the parties:

Shri Ali Hussain
S/o Shri Kudratullah
78, Sufitoal, Near Amar Ujala Press
Bareilly (UP) 243 005

The Central Public Information Officer
Indian Security Press
Nashik Road
Nashik 422 101

The First Appellate Authority
Indian Security Press
Nashik Road
Nashik 422 101

No. 2EE-1-CTE-3
Government of India
Central Vigilance Commission
(CTE's Organization)

Satarkta Bhavan, Block-A,
GPO Complex, INA,
New Delhi-110023
Dated - 15.10.2003

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

Sub: Tender Sample Clause

The Commission has received complaints that some organizations, while procuring clothing and other textile items insist on submission of a tender sample by the bidders though detailed specifications for such items exist. The offers are rejected on the basis of tender samples not conforming to the requirements of feel, finish and workmanship as per the 'master sample' though the bidders confirm in their bids that supply shall be made as per the tender specifications, stipulated in the bid documents.

2. While it is recognized that samples may be required to be approved to provide a basis in respect of indeterminable parameters such as shade, feel, finish & workmanship for supplies of such items but system of approving/rejecting tender samples at the time of decision making is too subjective and is not considered suitable, especially for items which have detailed specifications. The lack of competition in such cases is also likely to result in award of contracts at high rates.

3. It is thus advised that Government Departments/Organizations should consider procurement of such items on the basis of detailed specifications. If required, provision for submission of an advance sample by successful bidder(s) may be stipulated for indeterminable parameters such as, shade/tone, size, make-up, feel, finish and workmanship, before giving clearance for bulk production of the supply. Such a system would not only avoid subjectivity at the tender decision stage but would also ensure healthy competition among bidders and thus take care of quality aspect as well as reasonableness of prices.

4. It is requested that these guidelines may be circulated amongst the concerned officials of your organization for guidance. These are also available on the CVC's website, http://cvc.nic.in.

Sd/-
(A.K. Jain)
Technical Examiner
for Chief Technical Examiner

To

All CVOs of Ministries/Departments/PSUs/Banks/Insurance Companies/Autonomous Organizations/Societies/UTs.