

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

Complaint No. 26/2019/SIC-I

Shri Swaraj S. Phadte,
Office at Bhanav Apartment,
2nd floor,S-1,
Near mahalaxmi Temple,
Nextto Axis Bank, Panaji-Goa.

.....Complainant

V/s

1)The Public Information Officer,
Office of River Navigation Department,
Opp. Gurudwara, Betim,
Bardez-Goa.

.....Respondent/Opponent

CORAM:

Smt. Pratima K. Vernekar, State Information Commissioner

Filed on: 27/03/2019

Decided on: 22/04/2019

ORDER

1. The brief facts leading to present complaint are that the complainant Shri Swaraj S, Phadte by his application, dated 18/4/2018 filed u/s 6(1) of The Right to Information Act, 2005 sought for certain information from the Public Information Officer (PIO), of the Office of River Navigation Department pertaining to Pradeep Surya Salgaonkar , working in the office of River Navigation Department at Betim, Goa as listed at point No. 1 to 9 therein i.e (i)designation in the department (ii) date of appointment, date of his increment and promotions ,(iii)Birth certificate (iii) educational qualification (iv) service book (v) leave records since 1/1/2000along with the remarks of sanctioning authority and (vi) the residential address of Shri Pradeep Salgaonkar as per Government records . (vii) process of creation of post till his appointment and (viii)residential address as per the government records etc.

2. It is the contention of the complainant that he received reply/letter 11/5/18 from the PIO which was not to his satisfaction and as no any information was furnished to him, he vide letter dated 19/7/2018 informed PIO that he is still interested in receiving the information and as such again requested to furnish him the requisite information as sought by him.
3. It is the contention of the complainant that he received a letter on 14/8/2018 from Captain of Ports/First appellate authority there by providing him part of the information however according to him information at point no. 3 to 5 and 8 were denied and the letter of Shri Pradeep Salgaonkar dated 23/7/18 was enclosed to said reply .
4. It is the contention of the Complainant that as the information as sought was not furnished, he filed first appeal on 11/09/2018 to the First Appellate Authority and first appellate authority vide order dated 16/1/2019 directed the Respondent PIO to furnish the information to the complainant if available.
5. It is the contention of the complainant that despite of the order of the first appellate authority no information came to be furnished to him and on the contrary he received a letter dated 18/1/2019 from the PIO denying him information on the ground that it is a personal information of Shri Pradeep Salgaonkar and cannot be disclosed as per the letter dated 23/7/2018. As such he being aggrieved by action of PIO had to approached this commission in this complaint u/s 18 of the act on 27/3/2019 with the contention that the information is still not provided deliberately with malafide intention. The complainant herein have prayed for directions for furnishing him information free of cost and for imposing penalty in terms of section 20(1) and 20(2) of RTI Act against the PIO .

6. Notices were issued to the parties, pursuant to which complainant was present. Respondent PIO Shri Gajanan Arabekar was present .
7. Reply filed by PIO on 22/04/2019 thereby contending that he has complied the order of the First Appellate Authority (FAA) and requisite information have been provided to the Complainant.
8. The complainant during the proceedings submitted that his main intention was to receive information and now he had received the information from the PIO as per his requirement and as such he has no any further grievance against the PIO. He Showed his desire to withdraw the complaint proceedings and accordingly endorsed his say on the memo of complaint.
9. In view of the submission and the endorsement made by complainant, I do not find any reasons to proceed with the complaint . 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