

GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Kamat Tower, Seventh Floor, Patto Panaji-Goa

Appeal No. 191/2017/SIC-I

Shri Mahesh Kamat,
101, "Blossom",
CD Seasons Cooperative Housing Society,
Murida, Fatorda, Goa.

....Appellant

V/s

1. The Public Information Officer,
Shri Harishchandra Gawde,
The Goa State Agriculture Marketing Board,
Arlem, Raya Salcete.

2. First Appellate Authority,
Shri Ulhas G. Asnodkar,
The Goa State Agriculture Marketing Board,
Arlem, Raya Salcete.

.....Respondents

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

Filed on: 13/11/2017

Decided on: 23/04/2018

ORDER

1. By this appeal the Appellant Shri Mahesh P. Kamat assails the order, dated 6/11/2017 passed by the Respondent No.2 first appellate authority in first appeal No. GSAMB/RTI/01/2017/2005 filed by the appellant herein.
2. The facts in brief arises in the present appeal are that Shri Mahesh Kamat filed application dated 30/6/2017, sought information on 18 points and also the inspection of the file, registered, minutes proceedings of the marketing board meetings. The said information was sought by the appellant was in exercise of his right u/s 6(1) of the RTI Act, 2005.
3. According to the appellant, vide the letter dated 16/8/2017 PIO provide him the pointwise information. Being not satisfied with the information provided to him, he filed first appeal before the Secretary/Chairman of the Goa State Agriculture marketing Board on

18/8/2017 being first appellate authority who is the Respondent No. 2 herein and the Respondent No. 2 FAA dismissed the said appeal by order dated 6/11/2017 .

4. Being aggrieved by the action of both the Respondents, the present appeal is filed on 13/11/2017 with a prayer for directions for furnishing him information and for invoking penal provisions as against Respondent No.1 PIO as contemplated u/s 20(1)and(2) of RTI Act, 2005, and also compensation.
5. Notices of the appeal where issued to the parties. In pursuant to which appellant appeared in person. Respondent No. 1 PIO shri Harichandra Gawade and respondent NO. 2 Shri Ulhas Asnodkar appeared .
6. The reply was filed by Respondent NO.1 PIO and Respondent NO. 2 First appellate authority on 30/1/2018. The copy of the same was furnished to the appellant.
7. Since it was the contention of the appellant in the memo of appeal that information at point No. 4,11,12,,14,15,16,17,19 were denied the, PIO vide his reply dated 30/1/2018 replied/specifically answered the above points .
8. The appellant filed written argument on 19/2/2018 thereby contending that the information was incomplete , the Respondent again on 5/3/2018, replied/specifically answered the points at serial No.4,10,12,14,16,17 & 19 and also provide the information/documents with respect to point No. 1, 2, 3 and with respects to point No. 16 the copies of the bills/invoices of the medical stores of patient Dilip Rivonkar were furnished to the appellant .
9. The appellant again on 12/3/2018 filed application thereby raising grievances in respect of information furnished to him and further submitted that he desires to do the inspection of the files/documents connected to point No. 4,7,10,14 ,15 and 16.

10. The Commission directed to give the inspection of the files pertaining to point No. 4,7,10,14,15 & 16 and the PIO was directed to cover up the portion where ailments and other personal details of the parties are reflected in the said documents.
11. Accordingly the respondent PIO files compliance report on 26/3/2018 thereby enclosing the roznama dated 20/3/2018 bearing the signature of appellant and PIO of having carried out the inspection on 20/3/2018. Vide said compliance report the information at point No. 16 was denied interms of section 8(j) of RTI Act ,2005 .
12. On the subsequent dated of hearing the Appellant admitted of having carried out the inspection of the files pertaining to point No. 10,14,16,and 18and submitted that he shall furnish the list of documents which is required by him pertaining to above files.
13. Accordingly it was informed by the PIO that the list has been filed on 13/4/2018 by the appellant specifying his requirement and that the permissible information have been already provided to him . The appellant also admits of having received the information which he had sought by application dated 30/6/2017 and 13/4/2018.
14. Appellant submits that his main intention was to get the information in public interest. Since the information have been provided to him he is not pressing for penal provision and compensation. Accordingly he endorsed his say on memo of appeal.
15. In view of his submission and endorsement made by the appellant I find no reasons to proceed with the present appeal .
16. With the above observations the proceedings 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/-