

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

---

Appeal No. 104/2019/SIC-I

Shri. Jawaharlal T. Shetye,  
H.No.35/A,W. No-11,  
Khorlim, Mapusa Goa.  
Pincode-403 507

....Appellant

V/s

1) The Public Information Officer,  
The Headmistress,  
St. Michael's Convent High School,  
Anjuna-Vagator, Bardez-Goa.

2) First Appellate Authority,  
Dy. Director of Education,  
North Education Zone,  
Mapusa Bardez-Goa.

.....Respondents

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

Filed on: 25/04/2019

Decided on: 17/05/2019

**ORDER**

1. The second appeal came to be filed by the appellant Shri Jawaharlal T. Shetye on 25/04/2019 against the Respondent No.1 Public Information Officer (PIO) of St. Michael's Convent High School, Anjuna-Vagator, Bardez-Goa and against Respondent no. 2 First Appellate Authority (FAA) under sub section (3) of section 19 of RTI Act, 2005.
2. The brief facts leading to the second appeal are that the appellant vide his application dated 22/01/2019 had sought for certain information from Respondent No.1 Public Information Officer (PIO) of St. Michael's Convent High School, Anjuna-Vagator, Bardez-Goa on 6 points as stated therein in the said application. The said information sought in exercise of appellant's right under sub section (1) of section 6 of RTI Act, 2005.

3. 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 27/02/2019 wherein the information sought was denied to him by stating as "*not available*" and also by quoting the provisions section 8(1) of RTI Act, 2005.
4. It is the contention of the appellant he being aggrieved by such a response of PIO filed 1<sup>st</sup> appeal on 25/03/2019 to Respondent no 2 the Deputy Director of Education, North Education Zone, Mapusa Bardez-Goa being First Appellate Authority.
5. It is the contention of the appellant that the respondent No. 2 FAA vide order dated 16/04/2019 allowed his appeal and directed the Respondent no 1 PIO to issue the information to the appellant.
6. It is the contention of the appellant that in pursuant to the above order of FAA, the respondent PIO vide a reply dated 18/04/2019 once again denied the information at point number 1, 2, 3, 5 & 6 as such he is forced to approach this commission in his 2<sup>nd</sup> appeal.
7. In this back ground the present appeal came to be filed thereby contending that complete information is still not furnished despite of the order of FAA and seeking relief of directions to PIO to furnish the complete information as also seeking penalty and compensation for not giving information within time.
8. Notices were issued to both the parties. Appellant appeared in person. Respondent PIO was represented by Advocate Avinash Nasnodkar, who placed on record reply dated 17/05/2019 of Respondent No. 1 PIO. The copy of the same was furnished to the appellant.
9. The appellant after going through the reply submitted that he is satisfied with the information provided to him in the said reply and

as such does not desire to pursue with the matter and accordingly endorsed his say on the reverse of memo of appeal.

10. In view of the submissions and the endorsements made by the appellant I find no reasons to proceed with the matter and as such the present appeal proceedings stands disposed as withdrawn.

Pronounced in the open court. 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.

Sd/-

**(Ms. Pratima K. Vernekar)**  
State Information Commissioner  
Goa State Information Commission,  
Panaji-Goa.