

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
'Kamat Towers', Seventh Floor, Patto, Panaji –Goa

Tel No. 0832-2437880/2437208

email: [spio-gsic.goa@nic.in](mailto:spio-gsic.goa@nic.in)

website: [www.gsic.goa.gov.in](http://www.gsic.goa.gov.in)

**Shri. Atmaram R. Barve**

State Information Commissioner

**Appeal No. 308/2023/SIC**

Dr (Ms) Kalpana Kamat,  
Caldeira Arcade, B-Block,  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Bhute Bhat,  
Vasco-Go 403802.

**..... Appellant**

**V/s**

1. The Public Information Officer (Ramesh Parsekar),  
Mormugao Planning & Development Authority,  
Commerce Centre, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor,  
Vasco-Goa 403802

2. The First Appellate Authority (Ritesh Shirodkar),  
Mormugao Planning & Development Authority,  
Commerce Centre, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor,  
Vasco-Goa 403802

**..... Respondents**

Filed on:- 04/09/2023

Decided on:- 05/12/2025

**ORDER**

1. The present second appeal arises out of Right to Information (RTI) application dated 19/06/2023 made by Dr. Ms. Kalpana Kamat the Appellant herein and addressed to the Public Information Officer (PIO), Mormugao Planning and Development Authority.
2. On the same day that is on 19/06/2023 Shri. Ramesh Parsekar the PIO informed the Appellant herein that the

said RTI application does not contain specific queries and as such the desired information cannot be furnished.

3. Aggrieved by this reply the Appellant herein preferred the first appeal dated 18/07/2023.
4. Aggrieved by non communication from the First Appellate Authority (FAA) the appellant herein preferred the second appeal before this Commission on 04/09/2023.
5. Notices were issued on 18/09/2023 and appeal came to be heard from 23/10/2023 onwards.
6. On hearing dated 08/02/2024 the PIO made a submission that information sought from serial No. 3 to 9 of the RTI application is not available and the PIO also undertook to file additional submissions.
7. Thereafter on account of former State Information Commissioner demitting Office there was no further progress and regular proceedings resumed from 09/10/2024 onwards.
8. Thereafter, the matter was extensively argued by both the parties.
9. It was the contention of the Appellant that she had asked for inspection of certain documents and that her application was not appreciated by the PIO whereas the

PIO contended that nonspecific and vague applications cannot be entertained.

10. For the sake of arriving at a logical conclusion this Commission directed the PIO to give an opportunity to the Appellant herein to inspect certain specific files so that she can seek certified copies of only specific documents.
11. Thereafter, the appellant herein visited the Office of the Respondent PIO on 21/11/2024 and upon satisfactory inspection and providing relevant information to the Appellant herein the PIO submitted a compliance report dated 5/12/2024 which was also duly acknowledged by the Appellant.
12. The instant matters calls for the need for both the Appellants as well as the Respondents to become more sensible and specific in their approach in terms of submission of request as well as the disposal of the same.
13. The Appellant herein ought to have been specific in terms of raising queries under the Right to Information Act, as the PIO cannot be expected to respond to vague queries.
14. In the light of the above there are no grounds to establish denial of the information on the part of the Public Information Officer (PIO), on the contrary the PIO

has provided inspection as well as certified copies of the desired information to the Appellant herein in good faith.

15. Therefore, the present second Appeal stands dismissed with no order as to cost.

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/-**  
**(Atmaram R. Barve)**  
State Information Commissioner