

**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. 36/2024/SIC**

Shri Hemant Mahadev Kambli,  
r/o. House No. 260,  
Mahalaxmi Nagar,  
Sirsaim, Bardez Goa  
403502.

-----Appellant

V/s

The Public Information Officer (PIO),  
Health Officer,  
Primary Health Centre,  
Colvale, Bardez Goa,  
403513.

-----Respondent

**Filed on:- 02/02/2024**

**Disposed on: 08/01/2025**

**ORDER**

1. This present appeal arises out of the original Right to Information (RTI) Application filed by Shri. Hemant Mahadev Kambli on 04/07/2023 before the Public Information Officer (PIO), Dr. Shubhra Bhonsle at Primary Health Centre (PHC), Colvale, Bardez-Goa.
2. Vide reply dated 29/07/23 the said PIO provided point-wise response to the said RTI (Right to Information) application alongwith a Inspection Report; and also vide a separate letter dated 29/07/2023 called upon the Appellant herein to pay necessary fees and collect the relevant information.
3. Citing the grounds that the said reply was unsatisfactory; the Appellant herein preferred the first appeal dated 29/08/2023 before First Appellate Authority (FAA), Director-Directorate of Health Services, Panaji-Goa

4. The FAA vide judgment dated 03/11/2023 directed the PIO to give a clear and point wise reply to the Appellant within 10 days and also provide inspection of records to the Appellant within 05 days from the date of Judgment/order.
5. Citing grounds of non compliance of the orders of the FAA by the PIO; the Appellant has filed this Second Appeal dated 02/02/2024.
6. Due to the former Commissioner demitting office; proceedings could not be initiated immediately and upon resumption of regular proceedings, this appeal was taken up from 07/10/2024 onwards.
7. Upon hearing the oral and written submission of both the parties; this Commission is of the considered opinion as under:-
  - a) The Appellant has not been able to substantially prove the aspect of denial of information on the part of the PIO.
  - b) The PIO has been found to have taken due efforts to provide inspection of records; to the Appellant as well as his advocate.
  - c) Moreover the PIO cannot be expected to create any information and has to provide the seeker; all the information which is reasonably in the possession of the Public Information Officer.

Therefore, considering the above the present second appeal is dismissed.

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