

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

Appeal No.09/2025/SCIC

Shri. Pravinsingh A. Shedgaonkar,
H. No. 1615/2, Adjacent to High Court,
'Satyabhamakrishna', Malim,
Betim, Bardez-Goa

---Appellant

V/s

1.The Public Information Officer,
Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority,
O/o. Department of Environment & Climate Change,
Panaji-Goa.

2.The First Appellate Authority,
Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority,
O/o. Department of Environment & Climate Change,
Panaji-Goa.

-----Respondents

Shri Aravind Kumar H. Nair – State Chief Information Commissioner, GSIC

Relevant Facts Emerging from the Appeal

RTI application filed on	- 07/10/2024
PIO replied on	- 30/10/2024
First Appeal filed on	- 08/11/2024
First Appellate order on	- Nil
Second appeal received on	- 13/01/2025
Decision of the Second Appeal on	- 30/06/2025

Information sought and background of the Appeal

1. Shri. Pravinsingh A. Shedgaonkar filed an application dated 07/10/2024 under RTI Act, 2005 to the PIO (Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority)seeking :
"Certified copies of permission granted, NOC, Inspection reports, photos, application for Survey at 117/13 and 117/6 at Nagorcem, Palolem, Canacona, South Goa."
2. In response to the RTI application, PIO (Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority) vide letter dated 30/10/2024 replied to the Appellant as under:

"With reference to your RTI application dated 07/10/2024 referred above the reply/information as available with this office may be collected on payment of Rs.244/-.

3. Being aggrieved by the reply/information of the PIO, Appellant filed first appeal dated 08/11/2024 to the First Appellate Authority, Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority stating that the Respondent has denied information with respect to the approved/proposed plan and prayed that Respondent PIO be directed to provide the requested information, free of cost, at the earliest.
4. Subsequently, Appellant preferred Second appeal dated 13/01/2025 before the Commission stating that the Respondent PIO has denied information which does not fall under the purview of Section 8 and 9 of the RTI Act and FAA has not pronounced the order in first appeal even after 65 days from filing the first appeal.
5. Besides, praying for direction to the Respondent PIO to furnish sought information, Appellant prayed for recommending training as well as disciplinary actions against Respondent and compensation.

Facts Emerging in Course of Hearing

6. Pursuant to the filing of the present appeal, parties were notified fixing the matter for hearing on 08/04/2025 for which PIO's authorised person (Samir Volvoikar, UDC/APIO) present but Appellant was absent. Matter adjourned to 19/05/2025.
7. When the matter took up again for hearing on 19/05/2025, Appellant appeared in person and Respondent PIO was represented by Adv. Venfreda Gracias. During the hearing, Adv. Gracias appeared on behalf of Respondent PIO submitted that the information sought by the Appellant, plan/design, cannot be furnished as it falls under the purview of exempted clause of the RTI Act, 2005. However, Appellant filed

copies of some cases decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in support of his request for information.

8. At this juncture, Presiding Commissioner directed the Respondent PIO's lawyer to arrange an inspection of the documents in question by the Appellant and then provide the copies of such inspected documents to the Appellant as per the provisions of the RTI Act.
9. Complying with the direction, inspection was granted to the Appellant by the Respondent PIO. Satisfied with the inspection and its outcome, Appellant submitted in writing before the Commission that *"As per the instruction of the Hon'ble CIC, inspection of the records was allowed by the Respondent PIO and copy of the plan also provided and matter may please be disposed."*
10. Since the Appellant's lone contention was the denial of approved/plan (sought at Point No. 3 of RTI application dated 07/10/2024) by the Respondent PIO, it was addressed by the Respondent PIO by allowing inspection of the concerned records/files by the Appellant and providing copy of the plan as sought by the Appellant upon inspection after intervention by the Presiding Commissioner, nothing more lies in the present appeal.

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.

- Proceeding stands closed.
- Pronounced in open Court.
- Notify the parties.

Sd/-

(ARAVIND KUMAR H. NAIR)
State Chief Information Commissioner, GSIC

