## **GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

`Kamat Towers', Seventh Floor, Patto, Panaji –Goa Tel No. 0832-2437908/2437208 email: <u>spio-gsic.goa@nic.in</u> website:www.gsic.goa.gov.in

## Appeal No.115/2021/SCIC

Herbert Valles, H.No. 103, Paliem Uccassim, Dupem Waddem Road, Bardez, Mapusa-Goa. 403507.

.....Appellant

V/S

The Public Information Officer, Sub Divisional Police Officer, Mapusa Police Station, Mapusa-Goa. 403507.

.....Respondent

Shri. Vishwas R. Satarkar

State Chief Information Commissioner

## Filed on: 03/06/2021 Decided on: 13/12/2021

## <u>ORDER</u>

- The Appellant, Herbert Valles, H.No. 103, Paliem Uccassim, Dupem Waddem Road, Bardez, Mapusa-Goa by his application dated 14/12/2020 filed under section 6(1) of Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter to be referred as 'Act') sought information from the Public Information officer (PIO), SDPO at Mapusa Goa.
- The said application was responded by the PIO on 12/01/2021, by furnishing information on point No. 1 and 2 and information at point No. 3 rejected since same is not available in the records of Mapusa Police Station.
- 3. Not satisfied with the reply of the PIO, the Appellant preferred first appeal before Superintendent of Police, North Goa at Porvorim, Goa being the First Appellate Authority (FAA).
- 4. The FAA by its order dated 09/04/2021, allowing the first appeal directed the PIO to provide copy of complaint dated 29/05/2018 and information at point No. 3 to the Appellant free of cost within fifteen days.

- Since the PIO failed to furnish the information and comply with the order of FAA, the Appellant filed second appeal under sec 19(3) of the Act, before the Commission.
- 6. Parties were informed through notice, pursuant to which the representative of PIO appeared and filed his reply on 03/08/2021.
- The Appellant, through his appeal contended that information at point No. 1 has been furnished, however information on point No. 2 and 3 has not been furnished inspite of the direction from the FAA.
- 8. According to the PIO, upon receiving the direction of FAA, he collected the information from Mapusa Police Station and vide letter No. SDPO/MAP/RTI-Appl-47/316/2021 dated 01/05/2021, and requested the Appellant to collect information from the office of PIO, on any working hours by providing identity proof.

Further according to PIO, the Appellant by letter dated 05/05/2021 claimed that the order of FAA did not mention that Appellant should collect the information from the office of PIO or to produce the identity proof to collect the information, hence information be delivered either by hand or through Registered AD Post. Pursuant to this letter the PIO furnished the available information by hand delivery on 06/05/2021 at the residence of Appellant.

9. During the course of argument, the Appellant submitted that, as per direction of FAA he has not received the information.

However with the intervention of Commission and willingness of representative of PIO, Commission directed the PIO to furnish the information on point No. 1 and 2 on next date of hearing.

10. During the course of hearing on 11/11/2021, the APIO, Shri. Tushar Lotlikar appeared and furnished bunch of documents

to the appellant by obtaining his endorsement and thereafter matter fixed for arguments/ clarification.

- 11. Since the Appellant did not appear for further hearings on 08/12/2021 and 13/12/2021, I presume that, Appellant is satisfied with the information furnished by the PIO.
  - Accordingly matter is disposed off.
  - Proceeding closed.
  - Pronounced in open court.
  - Notify the parties.

Sd/-**(Vishwas R. Satarkar)** State Chief Information Commissioner