

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

Shri Prashant S.P. Tendolkar,
State Chief Information Commissioner

Appeal No.112/SCIC/2017

Jawaharlal T. Shetye,
H. No. 35/A, Ward No 11,
Near Sateri Temple,
Khorlim- Mapusa Goa

..... Appellant

V/s.

- 1) The Public Information Officer,
Smt. Nazira Sayad,
Mapusa Municipal Council,
Mapusa – Goa.403507.
- 2) The First Appellate Authority,
The Chief Officer (Mr. Clen Madeira),
Mapusa Municipal Council,
Mapusa – Goa.
403507.

..... Respondents

Filed on : 28/07/2017

Disposed on: 30/04/2018

1) FACTS IN BRIEF:

a) The appellant herein by his application, dated 27/01/2017 filed u/s 6(1) of The Right to Information Act 2005 (Act for short) sought certain information from the PIO, Goa State Information Commission under several points therein. The said application was transferred to PIO herein u/s 6(3) on 30/01/2017.

b) The said application was replied on 02/03/2017. However according to appellant he was not satisfied with the information as furnished and hence the appellant filed first appeal to the respondent No.2, being the First

...2/-

Appellate Authority (FAA). The FAA in the course of hearing on 25/04/2017, granted further time to PIO to furnish information, which was accordingly furnished on 28/04/2017.

The FAA thereafter by order, dated 03/05/2017, disposed the said appeal by holding that information is furnished.

c) The appellant has landed before this commission in this second appeal u/s 19(3) of the act, contending that the information furnished is not satisfactory and has prayed for direction to furnish information as also for invoking penal provisions.

d) Notices were issued to the parties, pursuant to which they appeared. The PIO failed to file reply to the appeal within time granted. However on 05/04/2018 he filed his reply. Copy of the same was furnished to appellant.

2. FINDINGS:

a) Perused the records, more particularly the application u/s 6(1) of the act. By said application the appellant has sought from the PIO of this commission to furnish certain information, which application was transferred to the respondent PIO herein u/s 6(3) of the act. The said application was replied by PIO on 25/4/2017 giving certain information. To some of the points the PIO had annexed the annexures.

b) By contending that the reply was not satisfactory the appellant approached the FAA. In the said first appeal the appellant had not clarified as to why he is not satisfied with the information. However on the instructions of FAA further information was furnished on 28/04/2017. During

...3/-

the hearing of the first appeal the appellant remained absent. Rightly the FAA has held that the information was furnished.

c) Though the appellant in this second appeal contends that the information is not satisfactory he has not elaborated as to why he contends so. No specific grounds are pleaded to hold the same as unsatisfactory.

d) I have perused the reply of PIO u/s 7(1) of the act dated 02/03/2017 and the additional reply, dated 28/04/2017. On considering the application for information and the said response I find that the application of the appellant is appropriately replied and the information is furnished. In the above circumstances I find no merits in the appeal and hence I dispose the same with the following:

O R D E R

The appeal is dismissed. Notify the parties.

Proceedings closed.

Pronounced in the open proceedings.

Sd/-
(Prashant S.P. Tendolkar)
State Chief Information Commissioner
Goa State Information Commission
Panaji - Goa