GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
'Kamat Towers', Seventh Floor, Patto, Panaji –Goa
Tel No. 0832-2437880/2437208 email: spio-gsic.goa@nic.in
website: www.gsic.goa.gov.in

Appeal No. 06/2025/SIC

Master Sousa Leonardo Caetano,
370, S. Bras Ilhas,
P.O. Marcella, Tiswadi,
Goa 403107. **..... Appellant**

V/s

1.The Public Information Officer,
Office of Mamlatdar of Tiswadi Taluka,
Panaji-Goa.

2.The First Appellate Authority,
Office of Mamlatdar of Tiswadi,
Panaji-Goa. **.....Respondents**

Shri. Atmaram R. Barve State Information Commissioner

Filed on: 06/01/2025
Disposed on: 12/08/2025

O R D E R

1. The present second appeal arises out of the Right to Information (RTI) application dated 12/08/2024 made by the Appellant, Shri. Master Sousa Caetano and addressed to the Public Information Officer (PIO) at office of Mamlatdar of Tiswadi Taluka.

2. In response to the said application, PIO, Shraddha Naik vide reply dated 03/09/2024 requested the Appellant herein to collect the available information on any working day upon payment of necessary fees.

3. Thereafter on grounds that income and expenditure of current year has not been provided by the PIO, the Appellant herein preferred first appeal dated 17/09/2024.

4. Vide Order dated 11/11/2024, the First Appellate Authority (FAA) rejected the contention of the Appellant and dismissed the first appeal.

5. Aggrieved by this order, the Appellant herein preferred second appeal before this Commission vide appeal memo dated 06/01/2025, contending that the PIO has not satisfactorily responded to point No. 2 and 6 of his original RTI application.

6. Notices were served and matter came up to be heard from 17/04/2025 onwards.

7. Upon perusal of appeal memo as well as the replies filed therein, this Commission is of considered opinion that, the PIO has duly provided the information pertaining to point No. 2 of the Appellant's RTI application. Further, pertaining to point No. 6 of the RTI application, the information could have not been provided as the current financial year has not concluded and as such audit of income and expenditure cannot happen in ordinance.

8. Therefore, in view of above, the present second appeal stands dismissed.
    - No order as to cost.
    - Parties to be provided authenticated copies of the order.
    - 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