

**C J Wijayawardhana v Sri Lanka Telecom PLC (SLT)**

RTIC Appeal (by Documentary Proceedings) 888/2019 - Order adopted as part of the formal meeting of the Commission on 26.03.2019

Order under Section 32 (1) of the Right to Information Act, No. 12 of 2016 and Record of Proceedings under Rule 28 of the Right to Information Rules of 2017 (Fees and Appeal Procedure)

**Chairperson:** Mr. Mahinda Gammampila  
**Commission Member:** Ms. Kishali Pinto-Jayawardena  
**Commission Member:** Mr. S.G. Punchihewa  
**Commission Member:** Dr. Selvy Thiruchandran  
**Commission Member:** Justice Rohini Walgama

**Appellant:** C J Wijayawardhana

**Notice issued to:** Designated Officer, SLT

<b>RTI Request filed on</b>	15.08.2018
<b>IO responded on</b>	23.08.2018
<b>First Appeal to DO filed on</b>	31.08..2018
<b>DO responded on</b>	10.09.2018
<b>Appeal to RTIC filed on</b>	15.11.2018

**Brief Factual Background:**

The Appellant by request dated 26.06.2018 requested for the following item of information

*Giving specific reference to the Criteria/Policy and other related Circulars/Documents/Guidelines/Memos etc., on granting extension of service in SLT beyond 55 years of age of Grade A1 & A2 officers,*

*kindly provide me (the applicant) the following information relating to C J Wijayawardhana, DGM/Supply Chain Management, and Service No: 001344 (the applicant)*

- i. On what grounds/basis the Board of Directors of Sri Lanka Telecom PLC did not approve his (the applicant's) service extension beyond the age of 59 years (w.e.f*

12/01/2018) (Ref DGM/HR Operation's letter SAMO2/HROS/R RET/229/2017 dated 07/12/2017)

- ii. Subsequently, on what grounds/basis his (the applicant's) service was extended only by six months w.e.f 12/01/2018 subject to certain conditions such as taking all measures to improve the level of performance etc., (Ref DGM/HR Operation's letter AM04/HROS/EXT/2017 dated 26/12/2017)
- iii. On what grounds/basis his (the applicant's) service was extended by another six months with effect from 12/07/2018 when he (the applicant) neither accepted nor complied with the terms and conditions of the aforementioned letter. (Ref DGM/HR Operation's letter AM04/HROS/EXT/2018 dated 12/06/2018)

The IO on 23.08.2018 responded stating the following;

*"We have decided to reject your request for information dated 31<sup>st</sup> August 2018 as it is exempted information covered by section 5(1) of the Act. as per the provision of the RTI Act, section 5 (1)(a), the information requested relates to personal information, which could cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the particular individual."*

Dissatisfied with the response of the IO the Appellant lodged an appeal with the DO on 31.08.2018. The DO responded on 10.09.2018 affirming the IO's decision. Dissatisfied with the response of the DO the Appellant preferred an appeal to the Commission on 15.11.2018

**Order:**

In view of the main order of these connected appeals, RTIC Appeal (In-Person) /295/2018, /298/2018 and /299/2018 heard together with RTIC Appeals (In-Person) 319/2018 and 402/2018, dated 13.11.2018 this appeal is concluded on the basis that the information requested had been provided to the Appellant.

It is noted of record that the Appellant on the previous connected appeal hearings mentioned above, agreed before the Commission to be satisfied with the information provided to the Appellant by the PA on 13.11.2018 with regard to all connected appeals lodged by him in this regard.

Order is conveyed to both parties in terms of Rule 27 (3) of the Commission's Rules on Fees and Appeal Procedures (Gazette No. 2004/66, 03.02.2017).

The Appeal is concluded.

\*\*\*\*\*