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

Shri. Atmaram R. Barve State Information Commissioner

Appeal No. 56/2024/SIC

Shri Devendra D. Kunkolikar,
H. No. 769/1, Palem Siridao,
Tiswadi – North Goa. **.....Appellant**

V/s

1)Public Information Officer (PIO),
Village Panchayat of Siridao,
Palem, Tiswadi Goa.

2)First Appellate Authority (FAA),
Block Development Office,
Junta House, Panaji Goa. **.....Respondents**

Filed on: 27/02/2024
Disposed on :12/02/2025

ORDER

1. The present second Appeal arises out of the Right to Information application dated 27/10/2023 made by the Appellant herein Shri. Devendra D. Kunkolikar addressed to the Public Information Officer at Village Panchayat Siridao-Palem.

2. In response to the said Right To Information application within the stipulated time period of 30 days the Public Information Officer (PIO) Shri. Oswin Mascarenhas provided a pointwise reply providing certified copies of the information available and duly endorsing the information not available.

3. Citing the grounds that incomplete and incorrect information has been provided, the Appellant herein filed the first appeal dated 02/01/2024 before the competent first Appellate Authority.

4. On the grounds of not hearing the first Appeal and that no orders have been passed therein the Appellant herein preferred the present second appeal on 27/02/2024.

5. In the meantime the former State Information Commissioner demitted Office and as such proceedings in this matter could begin only from the month of October, wherein notices were issued to the concerned parties on 22nd October, 2024.

6. The Respondent PIO vide his reply submitted that item-wise information was provided to the Appellant herein and that whichever information was not available was also duly informed to the Appellant.

7. The Respondent PIO also submitted that the Appellant has visited the office of the Respondent and specifically stated that he doesn't require information pertaining to serial No. 1, 4, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19 and 26 of his Right To Information application.

8. During the course of arguments the First Appellate Authority contended that the proceedings of the first appeal herein could not be initiated due to oversite on the part of the staff.

9. It is noteworthy that in spite having been duly served and notified from time to time the Appellant herein has abstained from participating in the second Appeal and has not even bothered to purforth his counter contentions.

10. This Commission is of the considered opinion is that time is of essence while deciding RTI related matters and the opportunities to be given to the contesting parties cannot be endless.

11. In the context of this matter there appears to be a fair and reasonable conduct on the part of the PIO in so far as timely disposal of the RTI application is concerned.

12. There is no valid ground to believe that there is denial of information on the part of the PIO and as such the PIO is found to have acted in sync with the duties entrusted under section 7(1) of the Right To Information Act, 2005.

13. The First Appellate Authority (FAA) is cautioned not to repeat such acts of negligence towards hearing the first Appeals and the same shall create a standard operating procedure for acceptance and disposal of first appeals thereby ensuring that the right of the information seeker is not compromised in any manner whatsoever.

14. In view of the above, the present second appeal is dismissed with 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