

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

Appeal No. 76/2020/SIC-I

Shri Johny S. Dsouza,
Hno.48, Girkar Waddo,
Dando, Arambol, Pernem-Goa.

....Appellant

V/s

1) The Public Information Officer (PIO),
Shri Chandrakant Shetkar,
The Dy. Collector & SDO,
Pernem –Goa.

2) First Appellate Authority (FAA),
The Additional Collector-I,
Pnaji-Goa.

.....Respondents

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

Filed on: 13/03/2020

Decided on: 20/07/2020

ORDER

- 1) The second appeal came to be filed by the Appellant Mr. Johny D'souza on 13/03/2020 against the Respondent No.1 Public Information Officer O/o Deputy Collector and S.D.O, Pernem-Goa and against Respondent No.2 the Additional Collector –I and First Appellate Authority under Subsection (3) of section 19 of RTI Act 2005.
- 2) Brief facts of the present proceedings as put forth by the Appellant are as under:
 - a) In exercise of right u/s 6(1) of Right to Information of Act 2005, the Appellant filed an application on 20/08/2019 seeking information pertaining to display of signboard of PIO & First Appellate Authority in the Office premises as per section (4) of the RTI Act.
 - b) It is the contention of the Appellant that his above application filed in terms of sub section (1) of section (6) was responded by Respondent No.1 PIO on 19/09/2019 wherein he was informed

that the information sought by him is in reasoning form and as such does not come in the preview of RTI Act 2005, as such deeming the same as rejection, he filed first appeal with the Office of the Collector, Collectorate building Panaji-Goa on 14/11/2019 being First Appellate Authority in terms of section 19(1) of RTI Act which was registered as RTI/JUD/APL/49/2019.

- c) It is the contention of the Appellant that the notice of the said first appeal was given to both the parties after hearing of both the parties the Respondent No.2 allowed this appeal by order dated 15/01/2020 there by directing Respondent PIO, the Deputy Collector and S.D.O, Pernem to display in his office proper and visible signboard with the name of PIO and mobile number of PIO as well as First Appellate Authority within 15 days from the receipt of the order.
- d) It is the contention of the Appellant even after the order of First Appellate Authority, the Respondent PIO have not displayed the signboard on the wall of office premises of Deputy Collector Pernem and the said fact was brought to the notice of the Respondent No.2 First Appellate Authority by him by filling an application dated 14/02/2020.
- e) It is the contention of the Appellant that he has taken the photo of signboard of PIO and First Appellate Authority of the office premises of Deputy Collector of Pernem on 10/02/2020 and it is seen that the signboard of PIO and the First Appellate Authority is very small compared to other sign board of said office premises
- f) It was further contended by the Appellant that the PIO Shri Chandrakant Shetkar has not shown the name and mobile number of the PIO and the First Appellate Authority even after passing the order by Respondent No.2 First Appellate Authority and in support of the above contention he relied upon the

application filed before the Respondent No.2 dated 14/02/2020 and coloured xerox photographs.

- 3) In these above background the Appellant being aggrieved by the action of Respondent PIO has approached this commission in this second appeal as contemplated u/s 19(3) of the Act with the contention that the order of the First Appellate Authority has not been complied and it is the complete violation of said the order passed by First Appellate Authority and contravention of provision of RTI Act.
- 4) Matter was taken upon board and was listed for hearing and accordingly notices were issued to parties. In pursuant to notices Appellant was present in person. The Respondent PIO Shri Ravishankar Nipanikar was present alongwith Mrs. Romana Fernandes. Respondent No.2 First Appellate Authority was represented by Shri Viraj Bandodkar.
- 5) Reply filed by Respondent No.1 PIO on 15/07/2020 along with a two photographs of the signboard displayed in the Office premises showing the name and the other details of the PIO and that of the First Appellate Authority. Respondent No.2 First Appellate Authority filed his reply on 29/06/2020. The copies of both the replies were furnished to the Appellant along with the enclosures/photographs.
- 6) It was contended by Respondent No.1 PIO that he has joined the duty as S.D.M and PIO in the Office of Deputy Collector, Pernem Taluka on 05/06/2020 and the signboard showing the name of the PIO and First Appellate Authority and their mobile numbers and other details are displayed on the wall of the office premises and in support of his said contention he relied upon photo copy of the said signboard.
- 7) The appellant also submitted that since the Respondent No.1 PIO has put the signboard, he has no any further grievances and accordingly endorsed his say on memo of appeal.

- 8) Since now the present PIO has compiled the order of Respondent No.2 First Appellate Authority and has displayed the details on the signboard as required as per section (4) of the RTI Act, 2005, and since Appellant has no any further grievances with the same. I find that no further intervention of this Commission is required.
- 9) The appeal disposed and closed accordingly.

Notify the parties.

Pronounced in the open court.

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.

Sd/-
(Ms.Pratima K. Vernekar)
State Information Commissioner,
Goa State Information Commission,
Panaji-Goa