

**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. 315/2022/SCIC**

Alexandre Rebello,  
Flat No. EI-1, Block E, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor,  
Micon Coastal Paradise,  
Vasvaddo, Benaulim,  
Salcete-Goa 403716.

.....Appellant

V/S

The Public Information Officer (PIO),  
Village Panchayat of Cana Benaulim,  
Benaulim, Salcete-Goa 403716.

.....Respondent

**Shri. Vishwas R. Satarkar**

State Chief Information Commissioner

**Filed on: 07/12/2022**

**Decided on: 27/04/2023**

**FACTS IN BRIEF**

1. The Appellant, Alexandre Rebello r/o. Flat No. EI-1, Block E, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Micon Coastal Paradise, Vasvaddo, Benaulim, Salcete-Goa vide his application dated 14/09/2022 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 Cana Benaulim, Salcete-Goa.
2. The said application was responded by the PIO on 29/09/2022 and furnished the information, except, the information at point No. 4,7 and 8(b) as said information is not available in the records. As regards to information at point No. 9, the PIO requested the Appellant to specify the information sought for.
3. Aggrieved and not satisfied with the reply of the PIO, the Appellant preferred first appeal before the Block Development Officer-I, Salcete, Margao-Goa being the First Appellate Authority (FAA).
4. The FAA vide its order dated 01/11/2022 partly allowed the first appeal and directed the PIO to furnish the information at point

No. 9 after thorough inspection and also to refund the extra amount charged to the Appellant, while providing the information.

5. It is admitted fact that the Appellant was reimbursed overcharged amount of Rs. 38/- by the PIO on 26/11/2022.
6. Now the only dispute remains with regards to the information at point No. 9 which reads as under:-

*"9. If the information under Q. 8(b) cannot be furnished by you for whatsoever reason, please give me copies of the last House Tax Bill Paid by these members / Panchas (or their family members, if the House Tax receipt is in the name of their family members) mentioned in Q. 8 above."*

7. It is the consistent stand of the PIO that available information has been provided to the Appellant and requested him to specify the information sought for at point No. 9 in order to furnish the information.
8. From the above it appears that the information sought by the Appellant is vague and ambiguous without specifying the house number, date and year of generation of information. 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.
9. In the instant case, the information sought for at point No. 9 cannot be treated to fall within the ambit of 'information' as defined under Section 2(f) of the Act.

10. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case **Central Board of Secondary Education & Ors. v/s Aditya Bandopadhyay & Ors. (C.A. no. 6454/2011)** has held as under:-

*"37. The right to information is a cherished right. Information and right to information are intended to be formidable tools in the hands of responsible citizens to fight corruption and to bring in transparency and accountability.*

*.....Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counter-productive as it will adversely affect the efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information. The Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquillity and harmony among its citizens. Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty."*

11. Considering the facts 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