

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

CORAM: Shri Juino De Souza: State Information Commissioner

Appeal No: 124/2017 & 249, 215 & 271/SIC/2016

Bharat L. Kandolkar
Vady, Candolim,
Bardez – Goa.

...Appellant

v/s

1. Public Information Officer,
Secretary,
Village Panchayat of Candolim,
Bardez - Goa
2. The First Appellate Authority,
Block Development Officer,
O/o Block Development Officer,
Mapusa, Bardez - Goa.

...Respondents

Relevant emerging dates:

Date of Hearing : 07-11-2019

Date of Decision : 07-11-2019

O R D E R

Sr No	Appeal Nos.	Date of filing RTI Application	Date of Reply of the PIO	Date of filing First Appeal	Date of Order of FAA	Date of filing 2nd Appeal
1)	Appeal No. 124/2017	05/04/2017	03/05/2017	12/05/2017	11/07/2017	16/08/2017
2)	Appeal No. 249/SIC/2016	25/08/2016	22/09/2016	26/09/2016	14/10/2016	08/11/2016
3)	Appeal No. 215/SIC/2016	15/06/2016	13/07/2016 14/07/2016 31/08/2016	26/09/2016	23/08/2016	05/10/2016
4)	Appeal No. 271/SIC/2016	07/10/2016	13/10/2016	18/10/2016	18/11/2016	06/12/2016

The above four appeals pertain to one and the same Parties and as such they are combined together and disposed by one common order.

1. **BRIEF FACTS OF THE CASE:** The Appellant herein Shri Bharat L. Kandolkar has filed four separate Second Appeals before the Commission. All important dates including the date of filing the RTI application, date of the reply of PIO, date of filing the First Appeals, date of order of FAA and the date of filing Second Appeals before the commission are listed in tabulation form.

2. The main grievance of the Appellant is that despite the order of the First Appellate authority (FAA), directing the PIO to allow inspection and to furnish information, the same has not been complied and therefore the Appellant has approached the Commission u/s 19(3) by way of four Second Appeals and has prayed to direct the Respondent PIO's to furnish information as requested in the RTI Application, to provide inspection of the records, files, registers etc. and to impose penalty, disciplinary action and for other such reliefs.
3. **HEARING:** During the hearing the Appellant is represented by Adv. Atish Mandrekar whose Vakalatnama is on record. The Respondent PIO, Secretary, V.P Candolim is represented by Adv. Siddesh R. Prabhudessai whose Vakalatnama is on record.
4. **SUBMISSIONS:** Adv. Atish Mandrekar for the Appellant submits that he has carried out the inspection of the files and indentified the information and that the PIO has agreed to provide the information as identified. Adv. Siddesh R. Prabhudessai confirms that the Appellant has inspected the files and has identified the information and further submits that the PIO has kept the information ready and requests that the Commission may pass order directing the PIO to furnish the information documents as identified by the Appellant.
5. **DECISION:** As the Appellant is satisfied with the inspection and has identified the information which is confirmed by Adv. Siddesh R. Prabhudessai for the Respondent PIO, as such the Commission accordingly directs the Respondent PIO, Secretary, V.P. Candolim to furnish the information so indentified by the Appellant after inspection within 15 days of the receipt of the order i.e (latest by 05/12/2019).

With these directions all the four Appeal cases stands disposed.

Pronounced before the parties who are present at the conclusion of the hearing. Notify the parties concerned. Authenticated copies of the order be given free of cost.

Sd/-
(Juino De Souza)
State Information Commissioner

