

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

'Kamat Towers', Seventh Floor, Patto, Panaji – Goa

---

**Appeal No.18/SIC/2014**

Shri Nitin Y. Patekar,  
R/o H.No. 369, Oshalbag,  
Pedne Goa.

..... Appellant

**V/s.**

1. Deputy Collector (Revenue),  
The Public Information Officer, (PIO),  
O/o Collectorate, North Goa-District,  
Panaji Goa.

2. Additional Collector-I,  
The First Appellate Authority,  
North Goa Panaji Goa.

..... Respondents

**CORAM:**

**Smt. Pratima K. Vernekar**, State Information Commissioner

**Filed on: 12/02/2014**  
**Decided on: 30/12/2016**

**ORDER**

1. By an application dated 4/9/13 the appellant Shri Nitin Y. Patekar sought from respondent No. 1 PIO, District Magistrate, North, Goa information /action report taken irrespect of his representation dated 12/8/13 made to collector North District panaji .
2. As he did not received any response from the Respondent No. 1 PIO to his RTI Application, he preferred first appeal on 14/10/13 before collector of North District, Panaji being first appellate authority and the Respondent No. 2 First Appellate Authority disposed the said appeal by order dated 13/12/2013.

..2..

3. Being aggrieved by the action of both the Respondent and did not satisfied with the order of order of the first appellate authority dated 13/12/13 , the present appeal came to be filed before this commission on 12/2/14. In the said appeal before this commission the appellant had prayed to the directions to the Respondent No. 1 PIO to furnish the correct information and for compensation, for penalty and for inquiry as against Respondent No. 1 PIO .
4. After notifying the parties matter listed up on the board and taken up for hearing .
5. During the hearing inspite of due services of the notice the appellant opted to remain absent . The Respondent PIO was represented by F.D.D'mello .
6. Reply came to be filed on behalf of Respondent No. 1 PIO on 13/6/2016 and on behalf of Respondent No. 2 FAA on 29/10/14. The representative of Respondent No. 1 PIO also showed the willingness to verify the records if information is available with them and furnish to the appellant. Accordingly he filed compliance report on 22/12/2016 enclosing the copy of the information furnished to the appellant vide their letter dated 8/12/2016. And the Xerox copy of the acknowledgment card.
7. An opportunity was given to the appellant to verify the information and report accordingly. Since he had not appeared with this commission with the grievances which shall be presumed that the information which have been provided to them on 8/12/2016 is as per his requirement and as to his satisfaction. It also appears that he is not interested in pursuing the said appeal.
8. As the information is furnished to the appellant no intervention of this commission is required at prayer II.

..3/-

..3..

9. If the correct information was furnished to the Appellant in the inception he would have saved his valuable time and hardship cause to him, in perusing the said Appeal.
10. It is quite obvious that the Appellant have suffered lots of harassment and mental agony in seeking information. He has made to run from pillar to pole, lots of his valuable time is being spent on seeking the information. If Respondent No. 1, then PIO had taken prompt and given correct information such harassment and detriment could have been avoided.
11. Public Authority must introspect that non furnishing of the correct or incomplete information lands the citizen before FAA and also before this Commission resulting into unnecessary harassment of the common men which is socially abhorring and legally impermissible.
12. The records shows that Respondent No. 1 PIO did not bother to reply the application filed by the appellant u/s 6(1) of RTI act with in stipulated time period such a Act is against the mandate of RTI Act . Such lapses in future on the part of the respondent No. 1 PIO will be viewed seriously .

Appeal disposed accordingly. And proceedings stands closed.

Notify the parties

Authenticated copies of the Order should be given to the parties free of cost.

Aggrieved party if any may move against this order by way of a Writ Petition as no further Appeal is provided against this order under the Right to Information Act 2005.

Pronounced in the open court.

Sd/-

**(Ms.Pratima K. Vernekar)**  
State Information Commissioner  
Goa State Information Commission,  
Panaji-Goa

