

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

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

Tel: 0832 2437208, 2437908 E-mail: [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. 73/2023/SCIC**

Mr. Krishna Raghunath Pandit,  
H. No. 884/11, Devashri Bhuvan,  
Porvorim, Bardez-Goa, 403501

....Appellant

V/s.

Mr. Basilo Pires,  
Secretary,  
The State Public Information Officer (PIO),  
Village Panchayat of St. Lawrence (Agassaim),  
Tiswadi-Goa

...Respondent

**Shri. Vishwas Satarkar**, State Chief Information Commissioner

**Filed on: 20/02/2023**

**Decided on: 10/01/2024**

**ORDER**

1. The Appellant, Shri. Krishna R. Pandit, resident of House No. 884/11, Devashri Bhuvan, Porvorim, Bardez, Goa, vide his application dated 02/09/2022 filed under section 6(1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter to be referred as Act), sought 51 points information from the Public Information Officer (PIO), Secretary of Village Panchayat St. Lawrence, Agassaim, Tiswadi, Goa
2. Said application was responded by the PIO on 29/09/2022, thus providing part of the information to the Appellant.

3. Being aggrieved and not satisfied with the reply of the PIO, the Appellant filed first appeal before the Block Development Officer at Panaji Goa on 31/10/2022, being the First Appellant Authority (FAA).
4. The FAA, by its order dated 05/12/2022, partly allowed the first appeal and directed the PIO to allow the inspection of available records and then furnish the information to the Appellant within 7 days from the date of receipt of the order.
5. Since the PIO failed and neglected to comply with the order of the FAA, the Appellant preferred this second appeal before the Commission under section 19(3) of the Act.
6. Notices were issued to the parties, pursuant to which, the Appellant appeared in person on 06/04/2023. Adv. Sakharay Naik put his appearance on behalf of the PIO and filed his reply on 05/06/2023.
7. The PIO, through his reply dated 05/06/2023, contended that, information with regards to point No. 1, 11, 12 and 15 has been already furnished to the Appellant and information with regards to point No. 2 to 10 and 13 to 51 is the information which relates to personal information and disclosure of which has no relationship to any public interest or activity.
8. In the course of hearing on 07/09/2023, the Commission directed the PIO to comply with the order of the FAA and provide the available information to the Appellant which is permissible under the law and matter was posted for compliance.

9. In the course of hearing on 10/01/2024, the PIO, Mr. Basilo Pires appeared alongwith Adv. S. Naik and submitted that he has complied with the order of the FAA and all the available information has been furnished to the Appellant.

10. The appellant admitted the above facts and submitted that, he is satisfied with the information provided by the PIO and hence, he does not wish to proceed further in the matter. In view of the submission of the Appellant, the matter is disposed off.

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

Sd/-

**(Vishwas R. Satarkar)**  
State Chief Information Commissioner