

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

---

Appeal No. 189/2019/SIC-I

Pranav Salgaonkar,  
H.No. 117, Partagal,  
Poinguinim, Canacona,Goa.

....Appellant

V/s

1) The Public Information Officer,  
Office of the Civil-Registrar-Cum-Sub-Registrar,  
Canacona-Goa.

2) First Appellate Authority,  
The State Registrar Cum  
Head of Notary Services,  
7<sup>Th</sup> floor Shram Shakti Bhavan,  
Patto Centre, Panaji Goa.

.....Respondents

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

Filed on: 30/4/2019  
Decided on:22/08/2019

**ORDER**

1. The second appeal came to be filed by the appellant Shri Pranav Salgaonkar on 30/4/2019 against the Respondent No.1 Public Information Officer of the office of Civil Registrar cum Sub Registrar, Canacona Goa and against Respondent no. 2 first appellate authority 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 27/11/2018 had sought for the information/inspection of all the Documents (a) related to survey No. 2 sub division I, (b)related to survey No. 273 sub division I and (c) the inspection of all the documents on basis of which sale

deed and all other deeds, agreements etc were made in survey No. 273 Sub Div.I, and survey No.2 Sub Div.I situated in Partgal, Poinguinim Village , Canacona Goa.

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 her above application filed in terms of sub section (1) of section 6 was responded by the respondent no 1 PIO on 30/11/2018 wherein he was informed that the office cannot provide the copy of the documents based on the survey Numbers and he was requested to provide registration number, pages Numbers, Volume numbers, as such deeming the same as rejection, the appellant filed 1<sup>st</sup> appeal on 7/12/2018 to Respondent no. 2 State registrar Cum Head of the Notary services , Goa being first appellate authority .
5. It is the contention of the appellant that the respondent no.2 first appellate authority vide order dated 6/2/2019 dismissed his appeal .
6. It is the contention of the appellant that being aggrieved by the action of both the respondent he had to approach this commission in his 2<sup>nd</sup> appeal as contemplated u/s 19(3) of RTI Act thereby seeking relief of directions to PIO to furnish him the information and for invoking penal provisions against both the Respondent .
7. Notices were issued to both the parties, in pursuant to which Appellant, the Respondent No. 1 PIO Shri Premanad Desai and Respondent No. 2 first appellate authority Shri Brijesh Manerkar appeared only during the first hearing i.e on 5/7/2019 .
8. Reply filed by Respondent no. 1 PIO on 5/7/2019 and the copy of the same was furnished the appellant thereby resisting the appeal. The matter was then fixed for arguments on 18/7/2019.

9. An email message dated 15/7/2019 was received from the appellant on 16/7/2019 which was inwards by the office of this commission vide entry No. 115 . In the said email message the appellant had informed this commission that he would like to withdraw the appeal bearing No. 189/2019/SIC-I and to consider the said appeal as withdrawn with immediate effect.
10. The said email message was placed before me on 22/8/2019 and this commission verified the email address mentioned by the appellant on memo of appeal vis-a-vis on the email message and it was found to be same. Since telephone number were available on memo of appeal, the undersigned Commission also decided to confirm the same telephonically from appellant and hence the instructions were given to Senior Steno to contact appellant on the telephone numbers mentioned by appellant on his memo of appeal, however the Senior Steno informed undersigned that she tried on his both cell numbers but was unable to contact him.
11. During the hearing on 22/8/2019, the PIO was represented by Smt. Kalpana Gajendikar U.D.C. of office of Civil Registrar Cum Sub Registrar of Canacona-Goa who filed application submitting that PIO has received message from the appellant herein through whatsapp intimating about withdrawal of present appeal.
12. After the said Email message the appellant also did not appear before this commission. Hence the Email message received by this commission from the appellant from his Email address appears to be genuine one.
13. In view of the email message dated 15/7/2019 received from the appellant to consider his appeal as withdrawn with immediate effect, and also based on the application dated 22/8/2019 filed on behalf of PIO by his representation, I find no reasons to

proceed with the present proceedings. Hence the present proceedings stands disposed as withdrawn.

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