## **GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

'Kamat Towers', Seventh Floor, Patto, Panaji – Goa

Complaint No. 41/2019/SIC-I

Shri Jawaharlal T. Shetye H.N. 35/A, Ward No, 11, Near Sateri Temple, Khorlim, Mapusa-Goa 403 507 V/s		Complainant
1)	The Public Information Officer, Sub Divisional Police Officer, Panaji-Goa.	
2)	First Appellate Authority, Superintendent of Police(North), Police Head Quarters, Alto-Porvorim-Bardez-Goa.	Respondents

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

Filed on:27/5/2019 Decided on: 10/07/2019

## <u>O R D E R</u>

- 1. This order disposes the present complaint filed by Shri Jawaharlal Shetye u/s 18 of the RTI Act, 2005. The brief facts of the present complaint are as under;
  - a) The complainant by an application dated 13/12 /18 filed u/s
    6(1) of the RTI Act , 2005 had sought for certain information from respondent NO.1 PIO regarding one letter bearing Ref. No. MIR:A&S:2018-19:24 dated 11/9/2018 addressed to the Police Inspector of Panaji police station by the Branch Manager of Bank of India , Miramar branch .
  - b) It is the contention of the Complainant that he did not receive any reply to his above application nor any information was furnished to him by the respondent No.1 PIO within the stipulated time of 30 days as contemplated under the RTI Act

1

Sd/-

as such deeming the same as rejection ,he filed 1<sup>st</sup> appeal u/s 19(1) of RTI, 2005 on 24/01/2019 before the respondent No.2 Superintendent of police(North) at Porvorim .

- c) It is the contention of the Complainant that Respondent no 2 first appellate authority by an order dated 6/03/2019 directed the Respondent no 2 PIO to register the copy of RTI application under the RTI Act and to furnish the required information within the prescribed time limit under the RTI Act, 2005 to the complainant.
- d) It is the contention the Complainant that the Respondent no.1 PIO failed to comply with the order of the Respondent No.2 first appellate authority and no information came to be provided to him by Respondent No. 1 till date as such he being aggrieved by the action of Respondent No.1 PIO is forced to approach this commission by way of complaint.
- 2. In this background the complainant has approached this commission on 27/05/19 by way of present complainant filed against both the above named respondents with the contention that still he has not received information from respondent NO.1
- 3. In the present complaint, the complainant has sought for directions for providing information/compliance of order of first appellate authority and for invoking Penal provisions for disobeying the superior's orders.
- 4. In pursuant to the notice of this commission, the complainant was present in person. Respondent no 1 PIO Shri Uttam Raut Dessai appeared. Respondent No.2 first appellate authority was represented by Shri Mangesh Mahale .
- 5. Reply filed by respondent No. 1 PIO on 10/7/2019 alongwith enclosures. The copy of the same was furnished to the complainant herein.

2

Sd/-

- 6. The complainant after going through the reply and verifying the information and the enclosures submitted that his grievances have been already redressed by the Respondent No. 1 PIO and as such he does not desire to pursue with the present complaint and intends to withdraw the same. Accordingly endorsement to that effect have been made by the complainant on the memo of complaint.
- 7. In view of the submission of the complainant and the endorsement made by him, I find no reasons to proceed with the matter. Hence the same is disposed as withdrawn.

Proceedings 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

3