

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

Appeal No. 206/2019/SIC-I

Mr. Sousa Leonardo Caetano,
r/o S. Bras, Gaundaulim ,
Ilhas Goa.

....Appellant

V/s

1)The Public Information Officer,
Office of the Mamlatdar of Tiswadi,
Panaji -Goa.

2)First Appellate Authority,
Office of the Deputy-Collector & SDM,
& SDO of Tiswadi at Panaji -Goa.

.....Respondents

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

Filed on: 25/06/2019
Decided on:19/08/2019

ORDER

1. The brief facts leading to the second appeal are that the appellant Mr. Sousa Leonardo Caetano vide his application dated 29/3/2019 had sought for the certain information on 4 points as listed therein in the said application from the Respondent PIO of the office of Mamlatdar of Tiswadi Panajim-Goa in exercise of his right under sub section (1) of section 6 of Right To Information Act , 2005.
2. It is the contention of the appellant that his above application were not responded by the respondent PIO within the stipulated time of 30 days neither the information was provided to him by the PIO, as such deeming the same as rejection, he preferred first appeal on 2/5/2019 before the Deputy Collector and SDO, being the First Appellate Authority (FAA) in terms of section 19(1) of RTI Act, 2005.
3. It is the contention of the appellant that the Respondent no. 2 First Appellant Authority vide his order dated 06/06/2019 allowed

his appeal and directed the PIO to furnish him the reply/required information within 3 weeks time .

4. It is contention of the appellant that no order of the first appellate authority was complied by the Respondent PIO and no information came to be furnished to him till this date .
5. In this background, the appellant being aggrieved by the action of respondent PIO has approached this commission in the present proceedings with a contention that information is still not provided and seeking relief for direction to Respondent PIO for providing him information, free of cost.
6. The matter was taken up on board and was listed for hearing after intimating both the parties. In pursuant to notice of this commission, appellant appeared in person. Respondent APIO Benny Vales was present and respondent No. 2 first appellate authority was represented by Pramod G. Shet .
7. Reply filed by Respondent no.1 APIO on 19/8/2019 thereby furnishing him the information. The Respondent no. 2 First appellate authority also filed his reply on 19/8/2019 and the copy of both the replies were furnished to the appellant.
8. The Respondent PIO during the hearing on 19/8/2019 had also carried the original files in case No.TNC/JM-1/Temp-injunction/Ponolim/01/2017 and case No. TNC/JM-1/Temp-injunction/Tal/07/2017 and the inspection of those files were carried by the appellant .
9. On carrying out the inspection of the above named files and also going to the information furnished to him on 19/8/2019, the appellant submitted to close the case and accordingly endorsed his say on the memo of appeal.
10. Since the information have now been furnished to the appellant, I find no intervention of this commission is required for the

purpose of furnishing the information and that prayer sought by the appellant hence becomes infructuas .

Appeal disposed accordingly. Proceedings stands closed

Notify the parties.

Pronounced in the open court.

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.