

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

Appeal No. 260/2024/SIC

Vasudev Limo Madkaikar,
H.No. 297/26, Ravalnath Nagar,
Mangado, Corlim-Goa.
403110.

.....Appellant

V/S

1. Superintendent/ PIO,
Directorate of Panchayat,
Patto, Panaji-Goa.

2. Dy. Director (Admin),
Directorate of Panchayats,
Patto, Panaji-Goa.

.....Respondents

Shri. Atmaram R. Barve

State Information Commissioner

Filed on: 27/11/2024

Decided on: 08/12/2025

Detailed Order passed on: 17/03/2026

ORDER

1. The present second appeal arises out of the Right to Information (RTI) application dated 05/04/2024 made by the Appellant, Shri. Vasudev Limo Madkaikar and addressed to the Public Information Officer (PIO) at office of Directorate of Panchayats, Panaji-Goa.
2. The PIO vide reply dated 04/06/2024 furnished the information to the Appellant but beyond the prescribed time limit of 30 days.
3. Aggrieved by the reply of the PIO, the Appellant filed first appeal dated 04/07/2024 before the competent authority.

4. The First Appellate Authority (FAA) vide order dated 06/08/2024 dismissed the first appeal by upholding the contention of the PIO.
5. Not satisfied with the order of the FAA dated 06/08/2024, the Appellant herein preferred second appeal vide appeal memo dated 27/11/2024 before this Commission.
6. Notices were issued and matter came up to be heard from 27/02/2025 onwards.
7. The PIO contended that, on receipt of the RTI application a Note dated 05/04/2024 and 26/04/2024 was issued to the Courts of the Panchayat to furnish the desired information as requested by the Appellant.
8. The Appellant contended that, the information furnished by the PIO is incomplete, vague and evasive.
9. During the hearing on 16/10/2025, the Commissioner directed to issue notices to all the deemed PIO's through the PIO directing them to remain present on next date of hearing.
10. On the next date of hearing i.e. 08/12/2025, all the deemed PIO's appeared and argued the matter.
11. Upon perusal of the appeal, replies and rejoinders filed by the parties, this Commission is of considered opinion as under:-
 - a. Primarily the PIO appears to have failed to discharge her duties by way of not providing information to the Appellant herein within stipulated time period of 30 days, but the information sought was voluminous in nature. So also it has

been noted from the available records that the PIO's has invited the Appellant for inspection on number of occasions.

- b. The First Appellate Authority (FAA) has discharged his duty by way of passing a speaking order in the first appeal.
- c. The Appellant herein has not been able to establish any larger public interest nor been able to produce any evidence on record to show that the information furnished to him by the PIO is incomplete or evasive.

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

- 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