

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

---

**Appeal No 35/2018/SIC-I**

**Shri Shrikant Naik Simepurushkar**  
**R/o. Flat No. F2,**  
**Ananta Apartment, Angod Waddo,**  
**Mapusa, Bardez-Goa**

....Appellant

V/s

**1) The Public Information Officer,**  
**Mamlatdar of Bardez,**  
**Mapusa, Bardez-Goa**

.....Respondent

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

**Filed on: 30/01/2018**

**Decided on: 15/03/2018**

**ORDER**

1. The Facts in brief which arises in the present appeal are that the appellant Shrikant Simepurushkar by his application dated 25/10/17 filed u/s 6 (1) of Right to Information Act, 2005, sought from Public Information Officer (PIO) of Office of Mamlatdar at Mapusa, Goa , certain information on 3 points as stated therein in the said application.
  
2. It is contention of the Appellant that the said application was not responded by Respondent PIO as such he preferred first appeal before the Deputy Collector and SDO of Mapusa, Bardez, Goa being First Appellate Authority (FAA).

3. The first appellate authority by an order dated 9/1/2018 disposed the said appeal by directing the Respondent PIO to issue the information to the appellant as sought by him by his application dated 25/10/2017 within 15 days from the issuance of the order, free of cost.
4. It is contention of the Appellant that the Respondent PIO did not comply the order of FAA neither furnished him the information, as such he was forced to approach this Commission by way of second appeal filed under section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005 on 30/1/2018. In the second appeal he had sought for the direction as against respondent PIO to furnish him correct and complete information before this commission, free of cost and for invoking penal provisions.
5. Notice was issued to both the parties. In pursuant to which appellant was represented by his son shri Siddesh Simepurushkar. Respondent PIO was represented by Shri Shailesh Kothawale and Shri Dattaprasad Kakatkar, UDC.
6. Reply filed by PIO on 9/03/2018 there by providing point wise information and also enclosing the copies of available information. Additional reply was filed by Respondent PIO on 15/03/2018 thereby providing clarification to the answers given at point No.1 and 2.

7. The representative of the appellant then submitted that he has received the information from the Respondent PIO and he is satisfied with the same and he has no further grievance in respect of information furnished to him. And submitted that he is not pressing for the penal provisions and accordingly endorsed his say on the last page of memo of appeal.
8. In view of the submissions of the representative of the appellant and endorsement made by him, nothing survives to be decided in the present appeal.
9. Appeal disposed accordingly. Proceeding 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/-