

GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Kamat Tower, Seventh Floor, Patto Panaji-Goa

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

Appeal No.147/2016

**Shri Pedrito Misquitta,
H.No. 234/B, Souza Vaddo,
Candolim, bardez, Goa.**

....Appellant

V/s.

**1.The State Public Information Officer,
Office of the Village Panchayat Candolim,
Candolim, Bardez Goa.**

**2.The First Appellate Authority,
Block Development officer, Bardez -I
Mapusa Goa.**

....Respondent

Appeal filed on: 17/08/2016

Decided on: 23/03/2017

ORDER

1. The appellant herein Mr. Pedrito Misquito by his application dated 04/04/2016 filed under section 6(1) under Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) sought certain information from the Respondent No. 1 Public Information Officer (PIO), O/o. Secretary Village Panchayat Candolim Bardez-Goa.
2. The said application was replied by PIO on 03/05/2016 interalia submitting that the information required at point No. 1 is not found and information at point No. 2,3,4 are not applicable.
3. Being not satisfied with the reply of Respondent No. 1 PIO and as deeming the same as refusal, the appellant filed 1st appeal under section 19(1) of RTI Act 2005 before the BDO, being the First Appellate Authority (FAA) on 01/06/2016 who is Respondent No. 2 herein and the Respondent No. 2 by an order dated 24/06/2016 allowed the said appeal and hereby directed the Respondent No. 1 PIO to furnish the information as available in the Office within 10 days from the date of passing of the order free of cost to the Appellant.

4. Since no information was received by him despite of the order of Respondent No. 2 FAA, the appellant approached this Commission by way second appeal on 16/08/2016 and prayed for direction for furnishing him the information as sought by him and for invoking penal provisions.
5. Notice were issued to the party, pursuant to which the appellant was present in person and Respondent No. 1 PIO was represented by Advocate Morajkar. In the course of the hearing the Advocate for the PIO offered to furnish the information to the Appellant as sought by him. Accordingly same came to be furnished to the appellant.
6. The Appellant was requested by this Commission to report whether said information was furnished as per his request. On the subsequent date of hearing the appellant submitted that information which came to be furnished to him stands duly replied and he is satisfied with the information furnished to him. He submitted that his main object to receive information then to penalize PIO as such he submitted that he doesnot desire to proceed with the matter. He was gracious enough not to press for penalty. Accordingly he endorsed his say on the memo of the Appeal.
7. In view of above, Appeal stands disposed proceedings 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 under the Right to Information Act 2005.

Sd/-

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

Kkfinal

