

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

**Second Appeal No. : 129/2018/SIC-I**

**Shri Goona Shankar Naik,**  
 Plot No. 100, Goa Housing Board Colony,  
 Near GEC College,  
 Farmagudi, Ponda – Goa.  
 403401.  
 Mb: 9823963541.

..... **Appellant**

v/s

(1) Public Information Officer,  
 Goa Education Development Corporation,  
 New Secretariat Bldg., Ground Floor  
 Alto Porvorim, Bardez Goa.

..... **Respondents**

---

**CORAM:**

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

**Filed on: 23/05/2018**  
**Decided on: 12/07/2018**

**ORDER**

1. The facts in brief which arises in the present appeal are that the appellant Shri Goona Shankar Naik, by his application dated 6/03/2018 sought certain information on 4 points from the Respondent No. 1 Public Information Officer (PIO) of Goa Education Development Corporation , as stated therein in the said application. The said information was sought by the appellant in exercise of his right u/s 6(1) of Right to Information Act, 2005.
2. On the receipt of said application by Respondent NO. 1 PIO he vide letter dated 27/03/2018 informed appellant that information sought at point no. 1 is kept

ready and he may collect the same from Administration section of their corporation after paying Rs. 22/-. Vide another letter dated 27/03/2018 the PIO informed the appellant the information requested at point no. 2 to 4 by him cannot be disclosed Since it consist of 3<sup>rd</sup> party information.

3. Being not satisfied with the above reply and as the Respondent No. 1 PIO declined to part him information at point no. 2 to 4, as such being aggrieved by the said decision, the appellant preferred first appeal before the Managing Director of Goa Education Development Corporation being First Appellate Authority (FAA) and the First appellate authority was pleased to passed an order on 24/04/2018 thereby partly allowing his appeal and directing the PIO to furnish the information at point No. 2 and 3 as sought by appellant vide his application dated 6/03/2018.
4. In compliance to the order of First Appellate Authority (FAA), the Respondent PIO furnished him information vide letter dated 4/05/2018, which according to the appellant was incomplete and vague information.
5. Being aggrieved by the action of both the Respondents, the appellant has approached this Commission on 23/05/2018 by way of second appeal

filed u/s 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005 on the grounds as raised in the memo of appeal.

6. In the present appeal the appellant has sought for directions for furnishing complete information as sought by him and for compliance of section 4(1) (a) and 4(1)(b) of RTI Act, 2005.
7. In pursuant to the notice of this commission the appellant was present in person. Respondent No. 1 PIO Vishal Signapurkar appeared.
8. The appellant during the course of first hearing submitted that he has fully received the information at point no. 1 of one to hundred students as sought by him. He further submitted that with regards to information at point no. 4 is not interested in the personnel details of student such as cell number, Mail Id, Pancard details, Photographs, Adhar Card etc., and further submitted that if the PIO agreed to provide him specimen copy of the application and the brochure he will not press point no. (4) and will file fresh application seeking additional details as required by him. The PIO also agreed to furnish him the copy of the specimen application alongwith brochure by speed post.

9. The appellant since was not satisfied with the information provided to him by a letter dated 4/05/2018 at point no. 2 and 3, the PIO agreed to furnish him the said information and clarification once again.
10. Accordingly on the subsequent date of hearing i.e. 11/07/2018 the PIO furnished the appellant information at point no. 2 and 3 as sought by the appellant and also submitted that the specimen application alongwith the brochure was sent to the appellant by speed post. The appellant have agreed of having received the said specimen application alongwith the brochure and submitted that he had filed fresh application seeking additional information on the same subject on 1/07/2018 and as such he is not pressing for information at point no. 4.
11. Appellant then submitted that he is satisfied with the information furnished to him at point no. 1 and 2 and did not agree with information provided at point No. 3 in particular with the interpretation of the word "outstanding" as according to him outstanding means loan disbursed minus recovery if any.
12. The Respondent PIO submits that students are given grants for their higher Education and once the course is completed after moratorium of one year the

student has to do the repayment of the said grant as per the guideline of GEDC and presently outstanding of Students as disclose in annexure is not created as per above procedure.

13. The PIO is supposed furnish the information as available and as it exists on the records of Public Authority. Since PIO have catgorily submitted that information regarding outstanding is not available on their records pertaining to Students shown at annexure I am unable to pass any directions to furnish information at point No. 3 as it would be redundant at this point of time. However the right of Appellant to seek the same in future is kept open by filing a fresh application u/s 6(1) of RTI Act 2005.
14. Since whatever available information is furnished to appellant I find no intervention of this Commission is required there too. And as such the prayer 3, 4 and 7 becomes infructuous.
15. Since one of the relief sought by the appellant was with regards to implementation of section 4(1)(a) of RTI act 2005 a clarification was sought by this Commission from PIO, to which he submitted that the same is in progress and he has made a letter to Managing Director Infotech Corporation of Goa Ltd.

On 14/06/2018 for designing GEDC website and for uploading the information in terms of 4(2) of RTI Act, 2005.

16. Since the obligation u/s 4(1)(a) and (b) of RTI Act, 2005 is still not complied by the Public authority concerned herein i.e. Goa Education Development Corporation, they are hereby directed to comply the same within 4 months from the date of receipt of this Order.

17. With the above direction appeal stands disposed. Proceeding stands closed.

Notify the parties.

Pronounced in the open court.

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.

Sd/-

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

Kk/-