

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
'Kamat Towers', Seventh Floor, Patto, Panaji – Goa

---

**Complaint No. 01/SCIC/2016**

Mr. Oscar Gomes,  
H. No.92/A, Novangully,  
Varca, Salcete-Goa.

..... Complainant

**v/s**

- 1) The Public Information Officer,  
Village Panchayat of Varca,  
Varca, Salcete–Goa.
- 2) The Block Development Officer,  
Mathany Building,  
Margao, Salcete –Goa.

..... Respondents

**CORAM**

**Shri Prashant S.P. Tendolkar**, State Chief Information  
Commissioner,

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

**Filed on : 07/01/2016**  
**Decided on : 02 /08/2016**

**ORDER**

**Facts**

1) By an application, dated 15/07/2015 the complainant has sought for information at point No.1 to 9 regarding the water well belonging to Mrs. Dinazette Gomes and also concerning his soak pit/septic tank. The said application was replied by the Respondent No.1, PIO on 16/08/2015 giving him the information to queries at Sr. NO.1 to 8.

2) Being not satisfied with the reply of the Respondent No.1, PIO the complainant filed 1<sup>st</sup> appeal under section

...2/-

19(1) before Block Development officer being FAA on 24/08/2015. The Respondent No.2 FAA, by order dated 09/09/2015 directed PIO to provide information to the complainant free of cost within 7 days, in respect of point No. 9 of the application dated 15/07/2015 of the appellant.

3) Since the order of the Respondent No.2 FAA was not complied, and being aggrieved by the order of the FAA the complainant filed 2<sup>nd</sup> appeal before this Commission as also this complain and has prayed for compensation and costs.

4) Notice of this complaint was issued to the parties inspite of service the complainant opted not to participate in the proceedings. The PIO remained present. In view of the absence of the complainant for continuous 3 occasions submissions of the PIO were heard. He submitted that the information as was sought by the complainant is already furnished which was not furnished earlier under a bonafide believe that the reply dated 16/08/2015 was covering all the queries and all the information as sought by the complainant are answered.

5) On going through the application u/s 6 of the Act it is seen that some of the queries therein were not specific and hence is explained accordingly. The second appeal no.1/SCIC/2016, which was filed by complainant was based on same application, dated 15/7/2015. The said appeal was finally disposed by this commission on 22/6/2016. While disposing the said appeal, Complainant had volunteered to wave the cost and

compensation due to the laps of PIO being for the 1<sup>st</sup> time and that in case of repetition he shall claim cost. We found this gesture of the appellant as fair and considering the circumstances and bonafides of PIO in furnishing information, said appeal was disposed without prejudice to the rights of the complainant to seek further information.

6) The complainant herein has remained absent to substantiate his claim for compensation. In view of the failure of the complainant to substantiate his claim, we have no alternative than to dispose off the present complaint with the following order:

**O R D E R**

The complaint stands dismissed. Proceeding closed.

Parties to be intimated.

Pronounced in the open Proceeding.

Sd/-  
(Prashant S. Prabhu Tendolkar)  
State Chief Information Commissioner  
Goa State Information Commission  
Panaji-Goa

Sd/-  
(Pratima K. Vernekar)  
State Information Commissioner  
Goa State Information Commission  
Panaji-Goa