

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. 280/2024/SIC

Dr(Ms) Kalpana V. Kamat,
H.No. 145 (V), Fatima Colony,
Alto-Dabolim-Goa.

.....Appellant

V/S

1.State Public Information officer,
Secretary Village Panchayat,
Chicalim, Goa 403711.

2.The Block Development Officer,
First Appellate Authority,
Mormugao, Vasco-da-gama,
Goa 403802.

.....Respondents

Shri. Atmaram R. Barve

State Information Commissioner

Filed on: 18/12/2024
Detailed order passed on: 20/07/2026

ORDER

1. The present second appeal arises out of the Right to Information (RTI) application dated 24/09/2024 made by the Appellant herein, Kalpana Kamat and addressed to the Public Information Officer(PIO), Village Panchayat Chicalim-Goa.
2. It is contended by the Appellant herein, that the PIO did not issue any communication to the said RTI application within stipulated time period of 30 days upon which the Appellant had to preferred first appeal dated 28/10/2024 before the competent authority.
3. The First Appellate Authority has till date not decided the matter and as such the Appellant herein had to prefer second appeal before this authority by way of appeal memo dated

18/12/2024. Thereafter notices were issued and matter came up to be heard from 17/03/2025 onwards.

4. During the hearing on 17/03/2025, the Commission directed the PIO to file reply to the appeal memo on or before 17/04/2025 and serve advance copy to the Appellant.
5. During the hearing on 24/04/2025, the PIO as well as Appellant filed their respective replies.
6. The PIO vide reply dated 17/04/2026 contended that the information sought by the Appellant is not clearly specified, vague and frivolous in nature and that the Appellant was instructed to specify the particulars of the information sought.
7. The PIO further contended that, during the hearing before the FAA, the Appellant was requested to specify and provide additional details of the information sought but nothing was provided and the FAA was pleased to pass Order dated 12/11/2024 directing the PIO to convey a convenient date for inspection of the records to the Appellant as per her RTI application.
8. The PIO also contended that despite of the order dated 12/11/2024 of the FAA, the Appellant on 07/03/2025 visited the office of the PIO but not for the inspection of the records but with intention of taking the Secretary of village Panchayat for site inspection instead of inspecting records.
9. The PIO further contended that the information sought by the Appellant is voluminous and same is scattered in many files which requires collection/collation of data which attracts Section 7(9) of the RTI Act for which he relied on the judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of Central

Board of Secondary Education and Anrs. v/s Aditya Bandopadhyay and Ors.

10. The Appellant vide additional documents/ rejoinder dated 17/03/2025 contended that she had clarified all the doubts raised by the PIO and also requested the PIO to transfer her RTI application under Section 6(3) of the RTI Act to closely related departments for which the PIO orally agreed.
11. The Appellant further contended that, the PIO did not carry out the inspection which was scheduled on 07/03/2025 inspite of her visiting stating that PIO is busy, 2 staff members careless, inspection could be done on mobile via Google Map.
12. Upon perusal of appeal memo, replies, rejoinder filed by both the parties, this Commission is of, the considered opinion as under:-
 - a. The PIO has grossly failed to discharge his duty under the RTI Act by way of not replying to the RTI application within the stipulated time period of 30 days.
 - b. The First Appellate Authority (FAA) has shown gross negligence by way of not deciding the first appeal till date.
 - c. However, perusal of the RTI application of the Appellant, reveals that the information sought by the Appellant is vague, not clear and not identifiable in nature.
 - d. The contents of the application are not specific in nature and as such, the PIO would have to interpret the contents of the application which is beyond the ambit of Section 2(f) of the RTI Act.

13. Therefore, in view of above the present second appeal is disposed off with following order:-

- a. The present second appeal is dismissed.
 - b. However, PIO is directed to adhere to the timelines prescribed by the RTI Act, 2005 henceforth while disposing RTI applications.
 - c. 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