

**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)

---

**Complaint No. 30/2025/SIC**

Kenneth Charles D'Souza,  
H.No. 158/E, Opp. Civil court,  
Altinho, Mapusa, Bardez-Goa.  
403507.

..... Complainant

V/s

1.First Appellate Authority (FAA),  
Goa Education Development Corporation (GEDC),  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor, SCERT Building, Porvorim-Goa  
403521.

2.Public Information Officer (PIO),  
Goa Education Development Corporation (GEDC),  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor, SCERT Building, Porvorim-Goa  
403521.

.....Opponents

**Shri. Atmaram R. Barve**

State Information Commissioner

**Filed on: 23/04/2025**  
**Disposed on: 13/08/2025**

**ORDER**

1. The present complaint arises out of the Right to Information (RTI) application dated 28/11/2024 made by the Complainant herein, Shri. Kenneth Charles D'Souza and addressed to the Public Information Officer (PIO) at Goa Education Development Corporation (GEDC), Porvorim-Goa.
2. The Complainant had sought information pertaining to the educational loan disbursed by the said Corporation.
3. Vide reply dated 23/12/2024, the PIO, Shri. Brijesh Shirodkar provided pointwise reply to the Complainant herein by annexing necessary documents to the said reply.

4. Aggrieved by this reply, the Complainant herein preferred first appeal before the competent authority on 07/01/2025.
5. Upon hearing both the parties, the First Appellate Authority (FAA) rejected and disposed the first appeal vide Order dated 28/03/2025.
6. Thereafter, the Complainant herein filed present complaint dated 23/04/2025 before this Commission, notices were served and matter came up to be heard from 17/06/2025 onwards.
7. Both the parties put forth their respective contention.
8. Upon hearing both the parties and upon perusal of material on record this Commission is of considered opinion as under:-
  - a. Prima facie there appears to be no cause for a complaint and the subject matter could have been dealt as second appeal; as for a complaint to be considered by this Commission there has to be fundamental flaw in discharging his duty as PIO.
  - b. In so far as the information sought by the Complainant is concerned, the PIO appears to have made necessary efforts in providing response to the Complainant in pointwise manner and also providing copies of relevant information.
  - c. As far as point No. 6 of the RTI application is concerned, the information sought appears to be all encompassing and vague in nature and also construed to reveal financial data of the said Corporation without any valid larger public interest.

- d. Furthermore, it has to be noted by the PIOs and information seekers that only such information can be furnished under the RTI Act which is available, existing and in possession of the public authority and also that the PIO cannot be held liable to furnish such information which would require creating opinion or drawing any inferences.
- e. In the instant matter there appears to be no such material on record to even remotely suggests that information has been denied or false information has been furnished.
9. Therefore, in light of above, the present complaint stands dismissed.
10. Pronounced in open on 13<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2025.
- No order as to cost.
  - Parties to be provided authenticated copies of the order.
  - 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