

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

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

**Appeal No.119/2018/CIC**

Smt. Anjani W/o Late Gopal Tilnaik,  
H. No.153, Vazarwada Podocem,  
Poriem, Sattari- Goa. .... Appellant.

V/s

- 1) The First Appellate Authority,  
Shri Pradeep Naik,  
The Deputy Collector & SDM,  
Bicholim Goa.
- 2) The Public Information Officer,  
Shri Rajesh Ajgaonkar,  
The Mamlatdar,  
Sattari Taluka,  
Valpoi -Goa. .... Respondents.

Filed on:10/05/2018

Decided on : 20/09/2018

**ORDER**

1) By this appeal the appellant has prayed for a direction to the FAA to instruct PIO, to furnish the information as sought. However in the course of hearing of the appeal on 06/07/2018, the A. K. of the respondent Authority remained present and furnished copies of documents as the purported information sought. Copy of the same was furnished to appellant for verification. The appellant alongwith her representative Shri Ulhas Mainiker, who were present on the subsequent date i.e. 24/07/2018 after verification informed that the said copies is the true and correct information as was sought by her.

In these circumstances, this Commission finds that its intervention is not required regarding said prayer, being redundant.

...2/-

2) The appellant has prayed for other reliefs. Though the appeal memo is silent regarding such relief specifically, under the act what the Commission can consider is u/s 20(1) and/or 20(2) or u/s 19(8) (b) of the Act.

3) In the present case the appellant has admitted that the application u/s 6(1) dated 17/01/2018 was replied on 06/02/2018, which is within the time prescribed for reply u/s 7(1). The only contention is that in the said reply information was repeated and hence the appellant was saddled with additional fees. It is also the grievance of the appellant that she is not satisfied with the information as was furnished.

4) Perused the records. Though the appellant has admitted having received the reply on 06/02/2018, copy of the same is not produced by the appellant. To enable this Commission to consider the contention of appellant that by said reply the information was repeated and that it was not satisfactory, it was necessary for the appellant to produce the said reply for perusal of the commission.

Though the appellant has contended that she was not satisfied with the reply, she has not specified, with reference to the reply, as to which part of the reply is not satisfactory and the reasons for holding so.

5) Considering the above circumstances this Commission finds no grounds to grant any further relief. As held above the information being furnished, nothing survives in the appeal.

In view of the above, the appeal is dismissed. Proceedings closed. Parties to be notified.

Sd/-

**( P. S. P. Tendolkar )**

State Chief Information Commissioner  
Goa State Information Commission  
Panaji - Goa