

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

Tel No. 0832-2437908/2437208 email: [spio-gsic.goa@nic.in](mailto:spio-gsic.goa@nic.in) website: [www.gsic.goa.gov.in](http://www.gsic.goa.gov.in)

---

**Appeal No. 169/2021/SCIC**

Kashinath L. Dhumaskar,  
H.No. 833, Vithaldas Vado,  
Morjim, Pernem-Goa 403512.

.....Appellant

V/S

1. The Public Information Officer,  
(Assistant Registrar – Teaching),  
Goa University,  
Taleigao Plateau, Taleigao-Goa 403206.

2. The Public Information Officer,  
(Assistant Registrar – PG Academics),  
Goa University,  
Taleigao Plateau, Taleigao-Goa 403206.

3. First Appellate Authority,  
Goa University,  
Taleigao Plateau, Taleigao-Goa 403206.

.....Respondents

**Shri. Vishwas R. Satarkar**

State Chief Information Commissioner

**Filed on: 28/07/2021**

**Decided on: 08/03/2023**

**FACTS IN BRIEF**

1. The Appellant, Shri. Kashinath L. Dhumaskar r/o. H.No. 833, Vithaldas Vado, Morjim, Pernem-Goa vide application dated 26/02/2021 filed under Section 6(1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter to be referred as 'Act') sought 42 points information from the Public Information Officer (PIO), Goa University, Taleigao Plateau-Goa.
2. The said application was responded by the PIO (RTI Co-ordinator) on 24/03/2021 in the following manner:-

*"This is with reference to your above referred RTI application.*

*In this regard I am forwarding the point wise replies received from the concerned PIO's of the University.*

<i>Point No.</i>		<i>Reply provided by</i>
<i>1,2,3,4</i>	<i>Annexure A (08 pages)</i>	<i>Assistant Registrar, Academic PG, PIO, Goa University</i>
<i>5 &amp; 6</i>	<i>Annexure B (09 pages)</i>	<i>Assistant Registrar, Academic PG, PIO, Goa University</i>
<i>7,8,9,10,11,12, 13,14,15,16,17, 18,19,20,21,22, 23,24,25,26,27, 28,29,30,31,32, 33,34,35,36,37, 38,39,40,41,42</i>	<i>Annexure C (74 pages)</i>	<i>Assistant Registrar, Academic PG, PIO, Goa University</i>

3. Being aggrieved and dissatisfied with the reply of the PIO, the Appellant filed first appeal before Prof. Rajendra Shirsat, the First Appellate Authority (FAA).
4. The FAA vide its order dated 09/04/2021 partly allowed the said appeal and directed the PIO to furnish the information at point No. 40, 41 and 42.
5. Since the PIO failed and neglected to comply with the order of the FAA dated 09/04/2021 and other grievances, the Appellant landed before the Commission by this second appeal under Section 19(3) of the Act.
6. Notices were issued to the parties, pursuant to which, Adv. Pundalik Raikar appeared on behalf of Appellant, Adv. A. Agni appeared on behalf of both the PIO's on 24/09/2021 and filed her reply. The FAA duly served opted not to remain present for the hearing.
7. It is not in dispute that, upon making the payment of requisite fees, the Appellant collected most of the information. However, main grievance of the Appellant was basically on three points viz

(i) The PIO has failed to comply the order of the FAA dated 09/04/2021 (ii) The information which was provided to him has not been properly certified by the PIO and (iii) That he is not provided with the copy of order of retention schedule under which of the files of Goa University were discarded.

8. In the course of arguments, since there was no proper justification for not compliance of the order of the FAA dated 09/04/2021, the Commission at the first instance directed the PIO to comply the order of the FAA and also to provide the attested copies of documents without going through the merits of the case and matter was posted for compliance.
9. During the course of hearing on 30/09/2022, Adv. B.D'Souza appeared on behalf of the Respondent No. 1 and 2 and filed the memo of compliance dated 30/09/2022. However, the Appellant was not satisfied with the additional information furnished to him and he raised some additional query by letter dated 02/11/2022 and thereafter the matter was posted for further compliance.
10. In the course of hearing on 12/01/2023, the representative of the PIO, Ms. Snehal Talkar appeared and submitted that, the Appellant is provided with the copy of the Retention Schedule Order bearing No. GU/Admn(NT)/Retention Schedule/581/2019 dated 17/09/2021 and also provided the attested copies of all the documents free of cost and complied with the directions of the Commission. A perusal of records clearly indicates that the information sought by the Appellant has been furnished to the Appellant free of cost.
11. The Appellant remained absent for subsequent hearings viz 14/02/2023 and 08/03/2023 and / or disputed the information provided by the PIO. Therefore, I presume and hold that the Appellant is satisfied with the information furnished by the PIO. Accordingly the matter is disposed off.

- Proceeding closed.
- Pronounced in the open court.
- Notify the parties.

Sd/-

**(Vishwas R. Satarkar)**

State Chief Information Commissioner