

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

“Kamat Towers” 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, Patto Plaza, Panaji, Goa – 403 001

Tel: 0832 2437880 E-mail: [spio-gsic.goa@nic.in](mailto:spio-gsic.goa@nic.in) Website: [www.scic.goa.gov.in](http://www.scic.goa.gov.in)

---

**Shri. Sanjay N. Dhavalikar**, State Information Commissioner

**Appeal No. 152/2022/SIC**

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

-----Appellant

**v/s**

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

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

-----Respondents

**Relevant dates emerging from appeal:**

RTI application filed on	: 09/03/2022
PIO replied on	: Nil
First appeal filed on	: 18/04/2022
First Appellate Authority order passed on	: Nil
Second appeal received on	: 06/06/2022
Decided on	: 30/01/2023

**ORDER**

1. The second appeal filed under Section 19 (3) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act') by the appellant, against Respondent No. 1, Public Information Officer (PIO) and Respondent No. 2, First Appellate Authority (FAA), came before the Commission on 06/06/2022.
2. The brief facts of this appeal, as contended by the appellant are that he had sought certain information from the PIO, upon not getting any reply within the stipulated period, he filed appeal before the FAA. The said appeal was not heard by the FAA. Being aggrieved, appellant preferred second appeal before the Commission.
3. Notice was issued to the concerned parties and the matter was taken up for hearing. Appellant appeared and pressed for the information. PIO and APIO appeared and undertook to furnish the information. Smt. Pallavi Dicholkar appeared on behalf of the FAA under authority letter. Shri. Abhay Rane, PIO filed reply on 08/08/2022 and compliance report on 29/08/2022.

4. Upon perusal of the records of the present matter it is seen that the appellant vide application dated 09/03/2022 had sought information on seven points and the said application was not responded by the PIO within the stipulated period. Similarly, first appeal was not decided by the FAA. Simultaneously, PIO and FAA were transferred and new officers took over as PIO and FAA. Upon taking over charge Shri. Abhay Rane, PIO, Taxation Section furnished information on point nos. 1 to 5 which was available in his section.
5. On the other hand, it is seen that, appellant though appeared before the Commission initially, later, upon receipt of the information decided not to remain present for the hearing. Similarly, appellant has acknowledged receipt of the information with his signature on the note attached to compliance report submitted by the PIO. It has been observed that the appellant during the proceeding of the present appeal, did not appear before the Commission after receiving the information, however, during the same period remained present in some other matters regularly. Hence, the Commission concludes that the appellant is either satisfied with the information received or he may be no longer interested in the information. He has not registered any say on the nature of information received, inspite of opportunities given to him.
6. In the background of the facts as mentioned above, the Commission finds that the PIO has furnished the information to the satisfaction of the appellant and nothing more survives in the present appeal.
7. Thus, the present appeal is disposed accordingly and the proceeding stands closed.

Pronounced in the open court.

Notify the parties.

Authenticated copies of the order should be given to the parties free of cost.

Aggrieved party if any, may move against this order by way of a Writ Petition, as no further appeal is provided against this order under the Right to Information Act, 2005.

Sd/-

**Sanjay N. Dhavalikar**  
State Information Commissioner  
Goa State Information Commission  
Panaji - Goa

