

GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

'Kamat Towers', Seventh Floor, Patto, Panaji –Goa

Tel No. 0832-2437908/2437208 email: spio-gsic.goa@nic.in website: www.gsic.goa.gov.in

Appeal No.37/2021/SCIC

Shri. Nilesh Amonker,
21, T1/T2, Kamat Kinara,
Miramar, Panaji-Goa.

.....Appellant

V/S

1. The PIO/ Executive Engineer,
Public Works Department,
WD-I (Bldgs), Govt. of Goa,
PWD Officer, Junta House, Panaji-Goa.

2. The First Appellate Authority/ Mr. Santosh Mhapne,
Public Works Department,
WD-I (Bldgs), Govt. of Goa,
PWD Officer, Altinho, Panaji-Goa.

.....Respondents

Shri. Vishwas R. Satarkar

State Chief Information Commissioner

Filed on: 16/02/2021

Decided on: 16/06/2022

ORDER

1. The Appellant, Shri. Nilesh Amonker r/o. 21, T1/T2, Kamat Kinara, Miramar, Panaji-Goa, by his application dated 04/09/2020 filed under section 6(1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter to be referred as 'Act') sought certain information from the Public Information Officer (PIO), Public Works Department, Works Division-I (Bldgs), Panaji-Goa.
2. The said application was responded by the PIO on 01/10/2020, informing the Appellant to collect the information by paying the requisite fee. The Appellant accordingly collected the information.
3. Dissatisfied with the information, the Appellant filed and contested the first appeal before the Superintending Surveyor of Works (SSW) of PWD at Altinho, Panaji-Goa being the First Appellate Authority (FAA).
4. The FAA by its order upheld the reply of the PIO and dismissed the first appeal on 18/12/2020.

5. Being aggrieved with the order of FAA, the Appellant landed before the Commission with this second appeal under section 19(3) of the Act.
6. Notice was issued to the parties, pursuant to which Adv. K.L. Bhagat appeared on behalf of PIO and FAA and filed his reply on 10/01/2022 and matter posted for argument on 12/04/2022.
7. During the course of argument on 12/04/2022, Adv. S. Keni appearing on behalf of Appellant submitted that she is only pressing upon the comparative statement as mentioned by the PIO in para No. 11 of the reply, therefore the Commission directed the PIO to produce the comparative statement on next date of hearing and matter was adjourned for compliance.
8. That on 28/04/2022, Shri. Girish Sawant, Assistant Engineer of PWD appeared alongwith Adv. K.L. Bhagat and placed on record the comparative statement, which was subsequently collected by the advocate for the Appellant.
9. During the course of hearing today i.e 16/06/2022, Adv. S. Keni appearing on behalf of Appellant submitted that she is satisfied with the information provided by the PIO and that she does not want to proceed with the matter and made endorsement on the appeal memo that "I am satisfied with the reply and information provided by the PIO."
10. In view of endorsement made by the Advocate for the Appellant, the matter is disposed off.
 - Proceeding closed.
 - Pronounced in open court.
 - Notify the parties.

SD/-

(Vishwas R. Satarkar)

State Chief Information Commissioner