

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

---

Appeal No. 207/2019/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 second appeal came to be filed by the appellant Mr. Sousa Leonardo Caetano on 25/6/2019 against the Respondent No.1 Public Information Officer Office of the Mamlatdar of Tiswadi at Panajim-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 22/4/2019 had sought for the Xerox copy of the original documents signed between the lessee and the lesser for the year 1/1/2017 to 31/12/2017 of Dougim Ela tenants Association .
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 his above application filed in terms of sub section (1) of section 6 was not responded by the Respondent no 1 PIO nor the information was furnished to him within a stipulated period of 30 days , as such deeming the

same as rejection, the appellant filed 1<sup>st</sup> appeal on 23/5/2019 to Respondent no. 2 Office of the Deputy-Collector & SDM, & SDO of Tiswadi at Panaji -Goa , being first appellate authority .

5. It is the contention of the appellant that the respondent no. 2 first appellate authority vide order dated 6/6/2019 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 certified copies of the information .
7. Notices were issued to both the parties, in pursuant to which Appellant was present in person. The Respondent No. 1 APIO Mrs Benny Vales was present and Respondent NO. 2 first appellate authority was represented by Shri Pramod G. Shet.
8. 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.
9. On 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.

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