

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

---

Appeal No. 165/2019/SIC-I

Master Souza Leonardo Caetano,  
S. Bras, Gaundalim, Cumbarjua,  
Ilhas, Goa-403107

.....Appellant

V/s

1. Public Information Officer,  
Mr. Vasu M. Usapcar,  
Directorate of Archives & Archaeology  
At Panaji-Goa.403001.

2. The First Appellate Authority,  
Mrs Madeira Blossom,  
Directorate of Archives and Archaeology,  
At Panaji-Goa.

..... Respondents

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

Filed on: 06/06/2019  
Decided on: 09/10/2019

**ORDER**

1. The second appeal came to be filed by the appellant Master Souza Leonardo Caetano on 06/06/2019 against the Respondent No.1 Public Information Officer of the Directorate of Archives and Archeology, Panaji-Goa and against Respondent No.2 First Appellate Authority under sub section (3) of section 19 of Right To Information Act, 2005.
2. The brief facts leading to the second appeal are that the Appellant vide his application dated 05/04/2019 had sought for certain information on seven points from the Respondent No.1 Public Information Officer (PIO). The Appellant at point No.1 to 4 had sought for the information of 3<sup>rd</sup> April, 2019 mostly pertaining to staff of said department, at point No.5 he intended to know the

name of MLA under whom the said department was coming and at point No. 6 he intended to know about the number of times the records of the said building were shifted somewhere else from the main building and at point NO. 7 he had sought the details of the list of books /files on S. Bras and S. Bartolomeu about Babtism/birth/death etc.

3. The said information was sought by the appellant in exercise of his right u/s 6(1) of RTI Act, 2005.
4. It is the contention of the appellant that his above application filed in terms of sub section (1) of section (6) was responded by the respondent no 1 PIO on 30/04/2019 wherein the information at point No.1 to 5 were provided, point No.6 was denied as the same was not coming under the definition of information and with regards to point No. 7 he was requested to visit their General section office to search the records.
5. It is the contention of the appellant that he being not satisfied with a said reply , filed 1<sup>st</sup> Appeal on 06/05/2019 to Respondent no. 2 Director Achieves at Panajim-Goa being first Appellate Authority interms of section 19(1) of Right To Information Act, 2005.
6. It is the contention of the appellant that the Respondent no.2 First Appellate Authority vide order dated 27/5/2019 dismissed his appeal by upholding the say of the Public Information Officer (PIO) hence he had to approach this commission in his 2<sup>nd</sup> appeal as contemplated u/s 19(3) of Right To Information, Act thereby seeking relief of directions to PIO to furnish him the CCTV footage and the information as sought by him at point 6 and 7 .
7. Notices were issued to both the parties, in pursuant to which Appellant appeared in person. The Respondent No.1 PIO Dr. Vasu Usapkar was present along with Advocate Kishor Bhagat and

Respondent No.2 First Appellate Authority Mrs B. Medeira was present during initial hearing .

8. Reply filed by Respondent no.1 PIO and by Respondent No.2 First Appellate Authority (FAA) on 04/7/2019 respectively. The copy of both the replies were furnished to the Appellant.
9. During the hearing on 4/07/2019, since appellant raised his grievance only with respect to answer given at point No.7, the Respondent PIO volunteered to give appellant the inspection of records being said information was voluminous in nature and the appellant also agreed for such arrangement and also agreed to provide list to the Respondent PIO of the information required by him. The PIO undertook to furnish him the information available on records to the appellant after the inspection.
10. Counter reply was filed on 15/7/2019 and on 12/9/2019 by the appellant. The copy of the same were furnished to the Respondent PIO.
11. The respondent PIO vide his additional replies dated 15/7/2019 and 9/10/2019 provided appellant the information as sought by him at point No. 7. The said information was verified by the appellant and accordingly made endorsement of having received the same and also submitted that he has got no any further grievance with respect to the information furnished to him in respect of his RTI application dated 5/04/2019 and submitted to dispose this appeal proceeding.
12. Since the available information have now been furnished to the appellant and also in view of the submission of the Appellant, I find no further intervention of this Commission is required for the purpose of furnishing information and nothing further survives to be decided in the present proceedings.

Appeal disposed and closed accordingly.

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