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. 62/2025/SIC

Kum. Benzira Furtado,
H. No. 316/B,
Sambatty, Orlim,
Salcete-Goa .....Appellant

V/s

1. Public Information Officer (PIO),
   The Principal,
   Canacona Government Industrial Training Institute,
   Mastimol Canacona-Goa 403702

2. First Appellate Authority (FAA),
   Director of Skills Development and Entrepreneurship,
   3rd floor, Shram Shakti Bhavan,
   Patto Plaza, Panaji-Goa,
   403001 ... Respondent

Filed on: 12/03/2025
Decided on: 10/04/2025

ORDER

1. The present second Appeal arises out of Right To Information application dated 06/12/2024 made by the Appellant herein, Kumari Benzira Furtado, addressed to the Public Information Officer (PIO) at Govt. Industrial Training Institute (ITI) Canacona.

2. In response to the said application the Public Information Officer (PIO) issued two correspondences dated 17/12/2024 wherein the said PIO provided information pertaining to point No. 1 of the said application and vide the second communication he informed the appellant herein that information pertaining to point No. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 cannot be provided as the disclosure of such information would adversely impact the ongoing investigation.

3. Aggrieved by this response the Appellant preferred the first Appeal dated 18/12/2024 before the appropriate authority.

4. The First Appellate Authority (FAA) upheld the stand taken by the Public Information Office (PIO) and dismissed the first Appeal.

5. Aggrieved by this order the Appellant herein preferred the second appeal before this Commission vide appeal memo dated 12/03/2025.

6. Notices were issued and matter was taken up for hearing.

7. On the present day both the parties put forth their contentions wherein the appellant contended that the information sought by her was pertaining to her life and liberty and as such the PIO ought to have issued the response within the 48 hours from the receipt of her application.

8. It is further contended by the Appellant that the information sought is about her own matter and that she is entitled to obtain all the necessary information.

9. The Public Information Officer (PIO) contended that the information sought from point No. 2 to 8 in the said application is covered under section 8(1) (h) of the RTI Act wherein a matter of sexual harassment at work place is being investigated and disclosure of information can potentially hamper a free and fair investigation.

10. In view of the above this Commission is of the considered opinion as under:-

    a. The aspect of receiving information within 48 hours on the grounds of life or liberty of a person, under section 7(1) of the Right To Information Act, 2005 has not been substantially proven

by the Appellant herein and as such the PIO appears to have duely discharged his duties by providing necessary response well within the stipulated time period of 30 days.

b. Although, the Appellant herein is herself a part of the pending investigation it would not be prudent on the part of the PIO to furnish any such document.

c. The conduct of the PIO appears to be within the prescribed framework of the RTI Act and cannot be construed as denial of information.

11. Therefore, in view of the above the present second appeal is dismissed.

12. No order as to cost.

proceeding stands closed.

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