

**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. 162/2024/SIC

Shri. B. D. Mote,  
Bhedshiwada, Bhuipal,  
Honda, Sattari, Goa  
V/s

..... Appellant

1. The Public Information Officer (PIO),  
O/o. Dy. Conservator of Forest,  
North Goa Division, Ponda-Goa
2. Conservator of Forest,  
First Appellate Authority (FAA),  
Van Bhawan,  
Altinho, Panaji-Goa

..... Respondents

Filed on:- 13/08/2024  
Decided on:- 18/03/2025

**ORDER**

1. The present second appeal arises out of the Right to Information application dated 15/02/2024 made by the Appellant herein Shri. B. D. Mote and addressed to the Public Information Officer (PIO) at the Deputy Conservator of Forests North Goa Division.
2. The Appellant herein had sought the full colour copy of the beat map/plan pertaining to Village Bhuipal in Sattari Taluka and had enclosed a black and white photocopy of the said map for the reference of the PIO.
3. Vide reply dated 13/03/2024 the PIO informed the Appellant herein that the information is available and can be collected upon the payment of Rs. 2/-.

4. Citing the grounds that the information provided does not match with the information originally sought by him, the appellant herein preferred the first Appeal before the competent authority.
5. The Appellant herein put forth his claim of mismatch in the documents however the First Appellate Authority (FAA) dismissed the first Appeal stating that the available document was provided by the PIO.
6. Aggrieved by this Order the Appellant herein preferred the second Appeal vide appeal memo dated 13/08/2024.
7. The present Appeal was filed during the period when the former State Information Commissioner had demitted Office and thereafter upon resumption of the regular proceedings notices were issued on 26/12/2024 and matter was taken up from 27/01/2025 onwards.
8. Vide reply dated 13/02/2025 the PIO reiterated the stand that whatever information was available has been provided to the Appellant.
9. The matter was argued by both the parties wherein the Appellant put forth his contention highlighting the issue of mismatch between the photocopy of Bhuipal Beat map in his possession vis-vis the colored map issued to him by the PIO.
10. The authorized representative of the PIO questioned the authenticity of the document relied upon by the

Appellant, whereas, the appellant herein submitted an affidavit cum declaration in support of the authenticity of the said beat map that he has relied upon in the instant matter.

11. Upon perusal of the appeal memo submissions and arguments this Commission is of the considered opinion as under:-

- a) Prima facie the PIO has responded to the Appellants RTI application within the stipulated time frame of 30 days.
- b) The Appellant also, in good faith has tried to assist the PIO in terms of getting access to a precise information by way of providing a supporting document.
- c) The PIO before issuing the information ought to have compared the same with the document relied upon by the Appellant because by the very nature of the application it was evident that the Appellant would compare both these documents.
- d) The First Appellate authority (FAA) also appears to have conveniently sidelined the issue of mismatch while dismissing the first Appeal as well as by asking the Appellant herein to take up the issue of mismatch in documents with the appropriate authority, in the same breath.
- e) It is the essence of the Right to Information Act that the information seeker deserves to be

furnished information without any air of ambiguity around the same.

f) By way of swearing an affidavit towards the authenticity of the document relied upon, the Appellant has strongly put forth his contention thereby making it necessary that this matter be investigated.

12. Therefore, in the light of the above the present second appeal is disposed with the following orders.

a) Present second appeal is allowed.

b) The PIO Shri. Jiss K.Varkey (Deputy Conservator of Forest, North Goa Division) is hereby directed to provide physical inspection of the concerned document and compare the document relied by the Appellant herein, so that precise document as desired by the information seeker can be provided. The PIO shall complete this exercise on 11/04/2025 during office hours and issue the concerned documents free of cost to the Appellant herein on the same day.

c) In view of the fundamental issue of mismatch in information provided, the Government of Goa Through its Chief Secretary is hereby directed to conduct an inquiry in to the matter and throw more light on this issue as the document in question can be relied upon by

other citizens and as such shall serve a larger public interest. The said inquiry shall be completed on or before 21<sup>st</sup> April 2025 and report of inquiry alongwith the conclusions shall be submitted to this Commission on 24/04/2025 at 11.00 a.m.

d) Registry to issue showcause notice to the PIO seeking clarification as well as compliance in terms of the orders above and the PIO shall remain present with the reply concerned on 24/04/2025 at 11.00 a.m. failing which necessary penalty and disciplinary proceeding shall be initiated.

e) No order as to cost.

f) 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