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. 218/2022/SCIC

Shri. Jawaharlal T. Shetye,
H.No. 35/A, Ward No. 11,
Khorlim, Mapusa-Goa. .....Appellant

V/S

1. The Public Information Officer,
Village Panchayat Assagao,
Assagao, Bardez-Goa.

2. The First Appellate Authority,
Block Development Officer-I,
Office of Govt. Complex Building,
Morod, Mapusa-Goa. .....Respondents

Shri. Vishwas R. Satarkar State Chief Information Commissioner

Filed on: 08/08/2022
Decided on: 31/08/2023

ORDER

1. The Appellant, Shri. Jawaharlal T. Shetye, r/o. H.No. 35/A, Ward No. 11, Khorlim, Mapusa-Goa by his application dated 22/02/2022 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), Village Panchayat Assagao, Assagao, Bardez-Goa.

2. Since the said application was not responded by the PIO within stipulated time, deeming the same as refusal, the Appellant preferred first appeal before the Block Development Officer-I, Bardez, Mapusa-Goa, being the First Appellant Authority.

3. The FAA vide its order disposed off the first appeal on 02/06/2022.

4. Since the PIO failed and neglected to furnish the desired information till date, the Appellant filed this second appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the Act.

5. Notices were issued to the parties, pursuant to which the Appellant appeared in person on 26/09/2022, the representative of the PIO Adv. Mishel D'Sa appeared and placed on record the reply of the PIO alongwith bunch of documents on 09/12/2022 and submitted that she has placed on record all the available information to the Appellant. FAA duly served opted not to appear and file his reply in the matter.

6. In the course of hearing on 25/04/2023, the Appellant J.T. Shetye appeared and collected the copy of the reply and documents and the matter was posted for rejoinder.

7. The PIO through his reply dated 09/12/2022 contended that, all the available information has been provided to the Appellant, at the first date of hearing before the FAA. However, without verifying the records of the FAA, the Appellant has preferred this appeal only to harass the PIO. The PIO also submitted that he again supplied all the available documents to the Appellant alongwith his reply dated 09/12/2022 in this second appeal.

8. The record indicates that, after receiving the reply and information by the Appellant on 25/04/2023, the Appellant did not remain present and participated in the further proceeding viz on 06/06/2023, 07/07/2023 and 09/08/2023 or disputed the content of reply/ information provided by the PIO. I therefore presume and hold that, the Appellant is satisfied with the information provided by the PIO.

9. In view of the facts that, since the existing and available information has been furnished to the Appellant and in light of remorse expressed by the PIO for causing delay in responding to the RTI application and in furnishing the information, through his additional reply dated 25/04/2023, a lenient view is taken. However, the PIO is made aware that he shall be diligent

henceforth in dealing with the RTI application and shall give priority to RTI matters. With this observation the matter is disposed off.

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

Sd/-

(Vishwas R. Satarkar)
State Chief Information Commissioner