

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

Complaint No. 28/SIC/2014

Shri Rajendra Siddarkar,
R/o. H. No. 322, Vikas Nagar, Karmali,
Corlim, Tiswadi, Goa

-----Complainant

V/s.

1. Public Information Officer,
Assistant Director of Administration,
State Directorate of Craftsmen Training,
Shram Shakti Bhavan,
Panaji-Goa

2. First Appellate Authority/
State Directorate of Craftsmen Training,
Shrama Shakti Bhavan, Panaji-Goa

....Respondents

CORAM :

Smt. Pratima K. Vernekar, State Information Commissioner,

Filed on:- 21/07/2014
Decided on: 13/11/2017

ORDER

1. This Order deals with the issue of maintainability of the present Complaint in the backdrop of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dated 12/12/2011 in Civil Appeal Nos. 10787-10788 of 2011 (***Chief Information Commissioner and another v/s State of Manipur and another***).
2. The relevant facts that arise herein for the purpose of deciding the maintainability is that the complainant Shri Rajendra Siddarkar herein filed application, dated 26/11/2013, u/s 6(1) of the Right to Information Act 2005

(RTI Act 2005) seeking certain information with regards to the order dated 19/11/2013 placing him under suspension from Public Information Officer (PIO), Office of State Director of Craftsmen & Training, Panaji, Goa.

3. The same was not responded by the Respondent PIO and as the information sought was not furnished, the complainant contends that the information is rejected as contemplated u/s 7 of the Act.
4. Being aggrieved by such rejection, the Complainant herein filed complaint before this Commission as contemplated u/s 18 of the RTI Act seeking several prayers more particularly seeking information as sought as/also for imposition of penalties on PIO.
5. After notifying the party the matter was taken up for hearing. During the hearing the complainant was present along with Advocate Saish Mambre. Respondent No. 1 Smt Dipti Kankonkar was present alongwith Mahima Binguinkar. Respondent NO. 2 was absent .
6. Reply was filed by Respondent no. 1 PIO Respondent No. 2 FAA on 6/12/16. The additional reply alongwith enclosure also submitted by the PIO on 29/03/2017 wherein it was contended that they have tried to communicate the Complainant vide letter dated 16/12/2013. Which was return unserved as "*unclaimed*". The PIO have enclosed in support in her contention the copy of the dispatch register and register A.D. book showing the entry of said letter send to Complainant.

7. The representative of Respondent No. 2 submitted that the present complaint is not maintainable as complainant has approached this commission without exhausting his first remedy.
8. It is the contention of the Respondent No. 2 First appellate authority that vide their letter dated 17/2/14 they had informed the appellant that his first appeal cannot be entertained as a same filed against the First Appellate Authority (FAA) itself .
9. The Advocate for the appellant during arguments submitted that he had not received any communication u/s 7 and that the defense of the PIO should not be taken into consideration as the same is not supported by any postal receipt or by Registered A.D. Card.
10. I have scrutinize the records available in the first also considered the submission made by the both the parties.
11. From the perusal of records it is seen that the first appeal was not entertained as the same was filed against the FAA itself and not against PIO. There are no records available in the file to show that the first appeal was filed by the Complainant against PIO, as such it could be gathered from the records and can be presumed that the Complainant has not exhausted his first remedy.
12. In the present Complaint, besides other reliefs, the Complainant has also sought the *direction to furnish the information as sought for by application u/s 6 of the RTI Act*. As such the interpretation of section 18 and 19 of RTI Act is required.

13. Section 18 of the Act opens with the words "*Subject to the provisions of this Act----*", which implies that this section operates in consonance with and not in conflict with or independent of the rest of the provisions of the Act. Thus section 18, as per the Act cannot be said to be an independent section but is subject to the provisions of this Act. In other words section 18 does not enjoy an overriding status over other provisions more particularly section 19. Hence both these sections are to be read together.
14. This Commission has dealt with a similar issue in Complaint No.171/SIC/2010. Complainant therein had filed a complaint against the order of PIO rejecting his request by invoking exemption u/s 8(1) (e) of the RTI Act. The SIC then, by his order, dated 24.06.2010 had held that in the said situation the proper course of action for the complainant therein would have been to file first appeal and adjudicate the propriety of refusal before first Appellate Authority.
15. While dealing with similar facts, the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Chief Information Commissioner and another v/s State of Manipur and another (civil Appeal No. 10787-10788 of 2011)*** has observed at para (35) thereof as under:

"Therefore, the procedure contemplated under [Section 18](#) and [Section 19](#) of the said Act is substantially different. The nature of the power under [Section 18](#) is supervisory in character whereas the procedure under [Section 19](#) is an appellate procedure and a person who is aggrieved by refusal in receiving the information which he has sought for can only seek redress in the manner provided in the statute, namely, by following the procedure under [Section 19](#). This Court is, therefore, of the opinion that [Section 7](#) read with [Section 19](#)

provides a complete statutory mechanism to a person who is aggrieved by refusal to receive information. Such person has to get, the information by following the aforesaid statutory provisions. The contention of the appellant that information can be accessed through [Section 18](#) is contrary to the express provision of [Section 19](#) of the Act. It is well known when a procedure is laid down statutorily and there is no challenge to the said statutory procedure the Court should not, in the name of interpretation, lay down a procedure which is contrary to the express statutory provision. It is a time honoured principle as early as from the decision in Taylor v. Taylor [(1876)1 Ch. D. 426] that where statute provides for something to be done in a particular manner it can be done in that manner alone and all other modes of performance are necessarily forbidden.”

The rationale behind this observation of apex court is contained in para (37) of the said Judgment in following words.

“ 37. We are of the view that section 18 and 19 of the Act serve two different purposes and lay down two different procedures and they provide two different remedies, one cannot be substitute for the other.”

Again at para (42) of the said judgment their lordship have observed.

“42. Apart from that the procedure under [Section 19](#) of the Act, when compared to [Section 18](#), has several safeguards for protecting the interest of the person who has been refused the information he has sought. [Section 19\(5\)](#), in this connection, may be referred to. [Section 19\(5\)](#) puts the onus to justify the denial of request on the information officer. Therefore, it is for the officer to justify the denial. There is no such safeguard in [Section 18](#). Apart from that the procedure under [Section 19](#) is a time bound one but no limit is prescribed under [Section 18](#). So out of the two procedures, between [Section 18](#) and [Section 19](#), the one under [Section 19](#) is more beneficial to a person who has been denied access to information.”

16. The similar issue also came up before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka at Bangalore in writ petition 19441/2012 & W.P. Nos 221981 To 22982/2012 C/W W.P. No. 24210/2012 & W.P. Nos 40995 To 40998/2012 (GM-RES). W.P. No. 19441/2012 & W.P. Nos. 22981-22982 /2012. Between 1. M/s Bangalore Electricity Supply Company Limited and others V/s The State Information Commissioner Karnataka Information Commission M.S.Bldg., Bangalore-560001.

“ The procedure adopted by the first respondents is clearly not permissible in Law. If the second respondent is aggrieved by the orders passed by the Public information officer under section 7 of the Act he has to file an appeal under section 19(1) of the Act before the appellate authority and in case he is aggrieved by the action or inaction of the appellate authority, he has to file a second appeal under section 19(3). Filing of an application under section 18(1) of the Act complaining the alleged inaction of the Public information officer is clearly not permissible in law”.

17. On careful analysis of the above decisions of the Hon'ble High Court and the Hon'ble Supreme court, nothing remains to be discussed further. The *issue regarding maintainability of the complaints u/s 18, seeking information, without filing appeals u/s 19(1) of The RTI Act*, as involved herein is laid at rest and the position of law is laid down as above. The facts involved in the case in hand and those before the Hon'ble High Court and the Hon'ble Supreme court are identical.

18. Nowhere it is suggested that an information seeker cannot approach the Commission under Section 18 but only after he exhausts the alternate and efficacious remedy of First Appeal, before approaching the higher forum. Judicial institutions operate in hierarchical jurisprudence. An information seeker is free to approach the Commission by way of a Complaint under Section 18, if his grievance is not redressed, even after the decision of the First Appellate Authority. As held above, Section 18, is 'subject' to provisions of Section 19 and Section 19 provides for an efficacious remedy to the fundamental requirement of information under the Act. Such a remedy of filing first appeal would also be in conformity with the provisions of section 19(5) of the Act and grant a fair opportunity to the PIO, to prove that the denial of request for information was justified. Seeking penalty and information by way of complaint, without first appeal, would be violative of such rights.
19. The full bench of this commission in several such matters as also held that such complaints without first appeal are not maintainable.
20. The PIO have also tried to justify that they tried to communicate complaint and /or responded the application of the complaint within stipulated time. However the said letter was returned unclaimed.
21. In the circumstances we hold that the present complaint filed against rejection of the application for information is not maintainable. I find that the interest of the complainant is required to be protected. I therefore proceed to dispose the present complaint with the following:-

ORDER

Complaint stands closed. Complainant is granted liberty to file first appeal under section 19(1) of The RTI Act in respect of the rejection/refusal of his request for information vide his application, dated 26/11/13 ,within forty-five days from today. If such an appeal is filed, the first appellate authority shall decide the same on merits in accordance with law, without insisting on the period of Limitation. The rights of the complainant herein to file complaint in case the complainant is aggrieved by the order of the first appellate authority in such appeals, are kept open.

Parties to be notified. Copy of this order shall be furnished to the parties free of cost. 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

Ak/-

