

GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

Appeal No. 36/SIC/2014

Pramod M. Singbal,
B-S-2, Nupur Vastu Co-Op,
Housing Society Ltd,
Near old Survey Office,
Borda margao Goa.Pin-403602.

..... Appellant

V/s.

1. Public Information Officer,
O/o of the Joint Director of Accounts,
Directorate of Accounts, South Branch Office,
Mathani Saldana Administrative Complex ,
Margao Goa.

2. The First appellate Authority,
(for the office of the Joint Director of Accounts, S.B. Margao)
1st floor Fazenda Building,
Behind old Secretariat, Panaji Goa.

..... Respondents

CORAM:

Smt. Pratima K. Vernekar, State Information Commissioner

Filed on: 23/04/2014

Decided on: 12/06/2017

ORDER

1. The brief facts of the case are that the Appellant Shri Pramod Singbal by his application dated 20/12/13 has sought for certain information u/s 6(1) of RTI Act, 2005 on four points as stated therein in the said application from the PIO , office of the Dy. Director of accounts south Goa at Margao who is the Respondent No. 1 herein .
2. The said application was responded by Respondent PIO on 17/1/14 thereby furnishing the information.
3. Being not satisfied with the reply of Respondent No. 1 PIO , the appellant preferred first appeal before the Director of Accounts being first appellate authority who is the Respondent No. 2 herein.

4. The respondent No. 2 FAA by an order dated 6/3/14 allowed the appeal of the appellant and there by directed the Respondent No. 1 PIO to furnish suitable information within 15 days to the appellant .
5. In pursuant to the order of Respondent No. 2 FAA, the respondent No. 1 PIO vide his letter dated 24/3/14 provided him the information on all this four points.
6. The appellant being not satisfied to the information provided to him, have approached this commission by way of second appeal. u/s 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005 seeking prayer for direction as against Respondent No. 1 PIO to provide him information as sought by him vide his application dated 20/12/13 and for imposing fine on both the Respondents for providing him incomplete and unwarranted information .
7. In pursuant to notice of this Commission, the appellant appeared in person. The Respondent No. 1 Smt . Philomena D'Cruze was present on behalf of Respondent PIO, who showed willingness to again provide information to the appellant. Accordingly the information came to be furnished to the appellant on 30/8/16 .
8. The reply also filed by Respondent PIO on 27/12/16 and written argument were also placed on record by them on 3/4/17.
9. The appellant also filed his counter reply on 2/2/17.
10. The appellant appeared in person on 12/6/17 and submitted that he is satisfied with the information provided to him, as such he waives his right to claim penalty and cost. Accordingly he made his endorsement on the memo of the appeal .
11. in view of his submission and endorsement made on the appeal by the appellant, nothing survives to be decided in the present appeal. Matter disposed accordingly 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