

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

**W.P.(C) No. 7915 of 2010 & CMs 20440-41/2010**

**RAKESH KUMAR SINGH ..... Petitioner**

**Through: Mr. Kamal Kumar Pandey, Advocate.**

**versus**

**UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondents**

**Through: Mr. Jatan Singh, Advocate for UOI.**

**Mr. Kuldeep S. Parihar and Mr. H.S. Parihar,**

**Advocates for R-2/RBI.**

**CORAM: JUSTICE S. MURALIDHAR**

**ORDER**

**26.11.2010**

1. In February 2009 an advertisement was issued by the Department of Economic Affairs inviting participation of all resident Indians including professional artists as well as non-professionals to participate in a competition for the design of a symbol for the Indian Rupee.

2. On a scrutiny of the applications it was found that 2644 applications were eligible. The Petitioner too submitted an entry. The entries were placed before a jury comprising seven members which met in New Delhi on 29th and 30th September 2009 and on 16th November 2009. Of the top five finalists, four had sent a single entry and one had sent four entries out of which the first two entries were considered. The Petitioner's entry did not qualify among the five finalists. The entry submitted by Shri D. Udaya Kumar; ``', was selected as the symbol that would denote the Rupee. The Petitioner is aggrieved by the said decision and has challenged it in this petition.

3. Innumerable questions were asked by the Petitioner under the Right to Information Act, 2005 ('RTI Act') eliciting responses on various aspects of the selection of the design. Many of the queries and the responses thereto by the Respondents have been enclosed with the petition. They give an indication of what transpired.

4. In response to one of the questions regarding the criteria adopted by the Jury in selecting the winning symbol, Respondent No. 1 informed the Petitioner as under:

"The criteria adopted by the Jury in selecting the symbol was that the symbol should represent the historical and cultural ethos of the country as widely accepted across the country and that the symbol has to be in the Indian national language script or a visual representation. The second stage of selection focused on the finer details such as whether the symbol:

(i) is distinct

(ii) can evoke a ready recall in India as well as internationally

(iii) had strength of design

(iv) is easy to write and typecast; and

(v) has integrity, unity of form and compact look."

5. In response to yet another question raised in the Lok Sabha on 20th August 2010 on the topic of "New symbol of Rupee", the Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance said:

"The symbol for the Rupee would lend a distinctive character and identity to the currency and further highlight the strength and robustness of the Indian economy as also a favoured destination for global investments."

6. One of the grounds on which the Petitioner attacks the process is that the advertisement inviting entries was not published in Hindi language newspapers. The Petitioner cannot be said to have been prejudiced on this score. He anyway submitted his entry pursuant to the advertisement.

7. Secondly, it is submitted that only four of the seven jury members attended the meetings at which the entries were examined and the winning entry was selected. There was apparently no rule of procedure devised mandating the presence of all jury members. In the considered view of this Court, this does vitiate the process, and does not warrant interference by the Court with the decision of such jury.

8. Thirdly, it is submitted that the precise criteria adopted by the jury members for selecting the winning entry was not made known. The criteria, which was also spelt out to some extent in the advertisement issued, has already been set out hereinbefore. That apart a marking system was used to rank the entries. The marks awarded to top five entries were disclosed in yet another response on 30th September 2010 by the Respondents to the Petitioner under the RTI Act. It cannot therefore be said that there was no criteria adopted for evaluating the entries.

9. This Court finds that no justifiable grounds have been made out by the Petitioner for interference with the decision of the Respondents in the matter.

10. The writ petition is dismissed. Applications also stand dismissed. S. MURALIDHAR, J.

NOVEMBER 26, 2010

akg