

**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. 245/2022/SCIC**

Shri. Narayan Datta Naik,  
H.No. 278/1 (3), Savorfond,  
Sancoale-Goa 403710.

.....Appellant

V/S

Shri. Raghuvir D. Bagkar,  
The Public Information Officer,  
Village Panchayat of Sancoale,  
P.O. Cortalim,  
Mormugoa-Goa 403710.

.....Respondent

**Shri. Vishwas R. Satarkar**

State Chief Information Commissioner

**Filed on: 15/09/2022**

**Decided on: 10/04/2023**

**FACTS IN BRIEF**

1. The Appellant, Shri. Narayan Datta Naik, r/o. H.No. 278/1(3), Savorfond, Sancoale, Mormugao-Goa vide application dated 12/05/2022 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), Office of the Village Panchayat Sancoale, Sancoale-Goa.
2. The said application was responded by the PIO on 23/06/2022, thereby providing the information at point No. 1 and 7 and rest of the information has been denied being information sought for is not specific and therefore requested the Appellant to visit the office of the PIO on any working day for inspection of documents.
3. Aggrieved and not satisfied with the information provided by the PIO, the Appellant filed first appeal before the Block Development Officer at Mormugao-Goa being the First Appellate Authority (FAA).
4. The FAA vide its order dated 15/07/2022 allowed the first appeal and directed the PIO to provide the information to the Appellant free of cost, within the period of 10 days.

5. Since the PIO has failed and neglected to comply the order of the FAA dated 15/07/2022, 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, the Appellant appeared in person on 17/10/2022, the PIO Shri. Raghuvir Bagkar appeared and submitted that available information has been furnished to the Appellant on 23/06/2022, he also sought time to file reply, however he did not appear for subsequent hearings.
7. Perused the pleadings and scrutinised the documents on record.
8. It is an admitted fact that, the Appellant has received the information at point No. 1 and 7; now remains the information in dispute with regards to point No. 2,3,4,5 and 6 which reads as under:-

*"(2) Kindly inform me Numbers of Land in position certificate submitted by your office in BDO Vasco office along with Development of works proposals (i.e. from 1 Jan 2021 till date).*

*(3) Kindly inform me numbers of EHN (House Numbers) were allotted by your office in Sancoale Comunidade properties (i.e After issue of Govt. Of Goa Circular No. 17/2022-RD/226, dt. 10/03/2022).*

*(4) Kindly inform me numbers of Electricity & Water connection NOC were issued by your office to the concerned encroached upon Sancoale Comunidade Land (i.e After issue of Govt. Of Goa Circular No. 17/2022-RD/226, dt. 10/03/2022).*

*(5) Kindly inform me numbers of Trade Licences were issued by your office to the concerned encroached*

*upon Sancoale Comunidade Land (i.e After issue of Govt. Of Goa Circular No. 17/2022-RD/226, dt. 10/03/2022).*

*(6) Kindly furnish me copies of information on above referred points No. 01 to 05.”*

9. A perusal of the above, it appears that information sought by the Appellant is vague and ambiguous. In order to get the information from the public authority the Appellant has to specify the information as required under Section 6(1) of the Act. When the request of the information seeker is clear, specific and unambiguous it would be possible for the PIO to identify the material on record. If the Appellant really wishes to receive the correct information, it is in his own interest that he shows diligence to identify the information. The PIO is not expected to do research to decipher all material record and then furnish the outcome to the Appellant.
10. The information at point No. 2 to 5 is specifically replied by the PIO that the information sought for is not specific and therefore requested the Appellant to visit the office of the PIO on any working day to carry out the inspection of documents.
11. The High Court of Bombay, Nagpur Bench in the case **The State Information Commissioner & Ors v/s Mr. Tushar Dhananjay Mandlekar (L.P. No. 276/2012)** has held as under:-

*"..... Instead of seeking information on some specific issues, the respondent sought general information on scores of matters. The application is vague and the application does not make it clear to the Information Officer as to what information is actually sought by the respondent from the Officer. It was literally impossible*

*for the appellants, as pointed by the learned Assistant Government Pleader to supply the entire information sought by the respondent.*

*.....The principle of **lex non cogit ad impossibilia** is clearly applicable to the facts of the case. Law does not compel a person to do that what is impossible."*

12. Considering the fact and circumstances, I find no malafide intention for non-furnishing the information by the PIO, hence, I am not inclined to impose penalty as prayed by the Appellant, the appeal is devoid of any substance therefore stands dismissed.

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

Sd/-

**(Vishwas R. Satarkar)**

State Chief Information Commissioner