

**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. 257/2021/SCIC**

Mr. Jawaharlal T. Shetye,  
H.No. 35/A, Ward No. 11,  
Khorlim, Mapusa-Goa,  
403507.

.....Appellant

V/S

1. The Public Information Officer,  
Mapusa Municipal Council,  
Mapusa-Bardez-Goa,  
403507.

2. The First Appellate Authority,  
The Chief Officer,  
Mapusa Municipal Council,  
Mapusa-Bardez-Goa, 403507.

.....Respondents

**Shri. Vishwas R. Satarkar**

State Chief Information Commissioner

**Filed on: 14/10/2021**

**Decided on: 19/04/2023**

**ORDER**

1. The Appellant, Shri. Jawaharlal T. Shetye, r/o. H. No. 35/A, Ward No. 11, Khorlim, Mapusa-Goa vide his application dated 16/06/2021 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), Mapusa Municipal Council, Mapusa-Goa.
2. The said application was not responded by the PIO within stipulated period, deeming the same as refusal, the Appellant filed first appeal before the Chief Officer, Mapusa Municipal Council on 20/07/2021 being the First Appellate Authority (FAA).
3. According to the Appellant, the FAA also failed to dispose the first appeal within the mandatory period of 45 days, therefore the Appellant landed before the Commission by this second appeal under Section 19(3) of the Act.

4. Notices were issued to the parties, pursuant to which the Appellant appeared in person, the PIO, Shri. Santosh Humraskar appeared on 09/11/2022 and filed the compliance report alongwith postal acknowledgement card and submitted that he furnished all the available information to the Appellant. The representative of the FAA, Adv. P. Dicholkar appeared on 21/07/2022 and filed her reply in the matter.
5. In the course of argument on 09/11/2022, the Appellant submitted that, the copy of enclosure with regards to information at point No. 1 and 4 was not furnished to him, the PIO Rajendra Bagkar sought time to furnish the rest of the information and matter was posted for compliance on 31/03/2023.
6. During the course of hearing on 31/03/2023, the PIO Rajendra Bagkar appeared and furnished the copy of enclosures at point No. 1 and 4. The Appellant submitted that he received the information from the PIO, however he stressed upon to impose penalty on the PIO for causing delay in furnishing the information.
7. It is true and correct that, there is delay in furnishing the information, however, it is also a matter of fact that the Appellant is filing plethora of RTI applications thereby hampering the administrative work of the public authority. The right conferred by the RTI Act should be exercised carefully and responsibly. It cannot be anybody's case that one single citizen should monopolise the time and resources of the public authority thereby depriving others of the services of the said public authority.
8. Considering the above facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to impose penalty on the PIO. Since available information has been furnished to the Appellant by the PIO, the matter is disposed off.

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

**Sd/-**

**(Vishwas R. Satarkar)**

State Chief Information Commissioner