

**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. 132/2024/SIC**

Shri. Suraj Gurudas Bhamaikar,  
r/o. H.No. 315,  
Mahalwada, Madkai,  
Ponda-Goa 403404.

-----**Appellant**

**V/s**

1.The Public Information Officer (PIO),  
Dy. Director (Administration),  
Directorate of Transport,  
Panaji-Goa.

2.First Appellate Authority (FAA),  
Director of Transport,  
Directorate of Transport,  
Panaji-Goa.

-----**Respondents**

Filed on:- 12/06/2024

Decided on:- 17/03/2025

**ORDER**

1. The present second Appeal arises out of the Right to Information application dated 15/12/2023 filed by the Appellant herein Shri. Suraj Gurudas Bhamaikar and addressed to Public Information Officer (PIO) at the Directorate of Transport, Govt. of Goa.
2. Vide reply dated 09/01/2024 the PIO Smt. Nancy Fernandes informed the Appellant herein that the information sought by him cannot be furnished in terms of section 8(1)(j) of the Right to Information Act (RTI) Act, 2005.

3. Aggrieved by this reply the Appellant herein preferred the first Appeal dated 07/02/2024 .
4. Vide order dated 04/04/2024 the First Appellate Authority (FAA), dismissed the first Appeal.
5. Aggrieved by the order of the first Appellate authority the Appellant herein preferred the second appeal before this Commission on 12/06/2024.
6. This Appeal came to be filed at the time when the former State Information Commissioner had demitted Office and upon resumption of regular proceedings notices were served on 13/11/2024 and matter came up to be heard from 18/12/2024 onwards.
7. The Respondent PIO filed the reply submitting that the information sought by the Appellant herein is personal information and as such personal records are entitled to protection from unwarranted invasion of privacy.
8. It is noteworthy that the Appellant herein has abstained from attending any hearings and has also not filed any response to the submissions made by the Respondent PIO.
9. In view of the above this Commission is of the considered opinion as under:-
  - a) The PIO in this matter has rightly provided response to the information seeker by way of

duly justifying the reasons in case of denial of information, as the onus to provide justification for denial of information is on the PIO.

b) Moreover, the manner in which the appellant herein has tried to seek information is also vague in nature.

c) Furthermore; even if the PIO had to take a lenient view towards the information sought, then such an action would lead to creation of a document which is beyond the purview of the RTI Act.

10. Therefore, in view of the above the present second Appeal stands dismissed and 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