

## **GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

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

---

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

**Appeal No.117/SCIC/2016**

**Bharat L. Kandolkar,  
Vady, Candolim,  
Bardez Goa.**

**....Appellant**

**V/s.**

**1. Public information Officer (PIO),  
Mr. Madhu G. Narvekar,  
Mamlatdar of Bardez,  
Mapusa Bardez Goa.**

**2. First Appellate Authority (FAA),  
Deputy Collector of Bardez,  
Mapusa Goa.**

**.....Respondents**

**Filed on: 30/05/2016  
Decided on: 18/05/2017**

### **ORDER**

1. Appellant Shri Bharat Kandolkar by his application dated 16/10/2015 sought information at point No. (a) to (f) from the PIO of the Collector North, Panaji-Goa. The said application was transferred by the PIO of the Deputy Collector Revenue to the Mamlatdar of Bardez who is Respondent No. 1 herein under section 6(3) of the Right To Information Act 2005.
2. The case of the Appellant is that he received the reply dated 5/01/2016 from Respondent No. 1, PIO herein which is according to him was incomplete, incorrect and unsatisfactory.
3. The appellant then preferred the 1<sup>st</sup> appeal before the Respondent No. 2 herein being First Appellate Authority (FAA) and Respondent No. 2 FAA by an order dated 23/03/2016 allowed the Appeal and directed the PIO to furnish the information to the appellant within seven days free of cost.

4. In compliance of the Order the Respondent No. 1 Public Information Officer (PIO) called upon vide his letter dated 4/04/2016 to collect the information.
5. It is further case of the Appellant that the Respondent No. 1 PIO once again furnished him incomplete and incorrect information on 22/04/2016 and being aggrieved by the action of the Respondent No. 1, PIO, the Appellant approached this Commission by way of second appeal under section 19(3) on 30/05/2016 with the prayer for furnishing him complete and correct information and for invoking penal provision.
6. In pursuant to the notice of this Commission appellant was present in person alongwith Advocate Atish Mandrekar. On behalf of Respondent No. 1 , Shri Dashrath Gawas appeared on one occasion and then PIO Madhu Narvekar appeared on few occasion.
7. Reply came to be filed on behalf of Respondent PIO on 2/03/2017. Information also came to be furnished to the Appellant on 13/04/2017, 5<sup>th</sup> May 2017 and on 18/05/2017. The PIO during the hearing also volunteered to give the inspection of the relevant records pertaining to Complaint of Appellant.
8. On the verification of the information the Advocate for appellant submitted the he is satisfied with the same and the same is as per his requirement. He further submitted that his motive/objective was to get information and not to penalize PIO, as such not pressing for penal provision. Accordingly endorsed, his say on the memo of Appeal.
9. In view of his submission and inview of the endorsement made by Appellant nothing survives to be decided in present appeal.
10. Proceeding stands disposed.

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

Kk/-