GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
"Kamat Towers" 7th Floor, Patto Plaza, Panaji, Goa – 403 001
Tel: 0832 2437208, 2437908 E-mail: spio-gsic.goa@nic.in
Website: www.gsic.goa.gov.in

Appeal No. 409/2023/SCIC

Amioto N. Rodrigues,
H. No. 345/B,
Near Dias Flats, Alto Mangor,
Vasco-Da-Gama, Goa 403802 …Appellant

V/s

The Public Information Officer (PIO),
Secretary,
Village Panchayat Cortalim,
Mormugao, Goa 403710 …Respondent

Shri. Vishwas Satarkar, State Chief Information Commissioner

Filed on: 03/11/2023
Decided on: 26/02/2024

ORDER

1. The Appellant, Shri. Amioto N. Rodrigues, r/o. House No. 345/B, Near Dias Flats, Alto Mangor, Vasco-Da-Gama, Goa 403802, vide his application dated 16/05/2023, 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) the Secretary, Village Panchayat Cortalim, Mormugao, Goa.

2. Said application was responded to by the PIO on 31/08/2023 informing the Appellant that the information has been kept ready and requesting him to collect the information from the Office of the Village Panchayat Cortalim, Goa.

3. Since the PIO failed and neglected to provide the information within the stipulated time of thirty days, deeming the same as refusal, the Appellant preferred first appeal before the Block Development Officer, Vasco Da Gama, Mormugao-Goa on 11/07/2023, being the First Appellate Authority (FAA).

4. The FAA, by its order dated 07/08/2023 allowed the first appeal and directed the PIO to furnish the information free of cost to the Appellant within 15 days from receipt of the Order.

5. Since the PIO failed and neglected to comply with the order of the FAA dated 07/08/2023, the Appellant filed this second appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the Act, seeking various reliefs.

6. Notices were issued to the parties, pursuant to which, the representative of the Appellant, Shri. Savio Brito appeared on 09/01/2024, the PIO Ms. Ankita Ghogale appeared on 09/02/2024 and filed her reply alongwith bunch of documents and submitted that she has complied with the order of the FAA and provided the information to the Appellant on 08/02/2024. However, as a matter of caution, she placed on record additional set of documents, and the matter was posted for arguments on 19/02/2024.

7. In the meantime, the representative of the Appellant collected the information on 13/02/2024 from the office of the Commission.

8. In the course of hearing on 19/02/2024, the representative of the Appellant, Shri. Savio Brito appeared and submitted that the Appellant has verified the information provided by the PIO and he is satisfied with the information, however he is insisting for penalty for causing delay in furnishing the information.

9. Having gone through the records it revealed that, the PIO replied the RTI application on 31/08/2023 and informed the Appellant to collect the information. The PIO also complied with the order of the FAA and provided the information free of cost to the Appellant on 08/02/2024 and on 13/02/2024. In the aforestated circumstances, I find no intentional delay on the part of the PIO. Therefore, I am not inclined to impose a penalty as prayed by the Appellant. Since the information has been furnished by the PIO to the satisfaction of the Appellant, nothing survives in the appeal. Accordingly, the matter is disposed off.

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

Sd/-
(Vishwas R. Satarkar)
State Chief Information Commissioner