

**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)

---

**Appeal No. 302/2025/SIC**

Shri. Romit C. Nasnodkar,  
Dangui Colony,  
Mapusa -Goa.

..... **Appellant**

V/s

1.The P.I.O. Mamlatdar,  
Office of Mamlatdar,  
Bicholim-Goa, 403504

2.The First Appellate Authority (FAA),  
The Dy. Collector,  
Office of Dy. Collector,  
Bicholim-Goa, 403504

.....**Respondents**

**Shri. Atmaram R. Barve**

State Information Commissioner

**Filed on: 19/11/2025**  
**Disposed on: 12/03/2026**

**ORDER**

1. The present Second Appeal arises out of the Right to Information (RTI) application dated 30/05/2025 made by the Appellant herein Shri. Romit C. Nasnodkar and addressed to the Public Information Officer (PIO), Administrator of Devalaya at Office of the Mamlatdar, Bicholim Goa seeking certified copies of the order issued by the Government of Goa under which the Mamlatdar of Bicholim is designated as the Public Information Officer (PIO) to provide information of Devalayas in Bicholim Taluka and number of cases in which the said Mamlatdar has furnished information after obtaining the same from the Attorney.

2. Thereafter, vide reply dated 25/06/2025, the PIO, Shri.Dattaprasad Toraskar provided a pointwise information to the said application within the stipulated time period.
3. Thereafter, citing the grounds that information provided by the PIO is not satisfactory and that there is no mention that Mamlatdar as Administrator of Devalayas is appointed as PIOs of Devalayas.
4. Vide order dated 22/08/2025 the First Appellate Authority rejected the First Appeal.
5. Aggrieved by this order of First Appellate Authority the Appellant herein preferred the Second Appeal dated 19/11/2025 before this authority.
6. Notices were issued and the matter came up to be heard from 04/02/2026 onwards. Both the parties argued the matter and they reiterated their stand taken during the First Appeal.
7. The crux of the Appellant's contention is that the order dated 21/04/2025 issued by the Under Secretary, Revenue-II of Government of Goa, is applicable to the Mamlatdar while functioning as a Mamlatdar and Executive Magistrate, and not in the capacity of Administrator of Devalayas.
8. Upon perusal of Appeal memo, replies of the PIO as well as other material on record this Commission is of considered opinion as under:
  - a. The contention of the Appellant herein appears to be misconceived in so far as the scope of work of Mamlatdar is concerned.
  - b. It is not disputed that the Mamlatdar is a public authority and hence it is to be understood that a public authority or a

PIO can provide information pertaining to the public authority which he represents or information relating to any private body which can be accessed by the public authority under any other law for the time being in force.

- c. Even if it is to be assumed for the argument sake that the Appellant's contention has merit, still this Commission is not the appropriate forum to decide the maintainability of the issue in question.
  - d. That apart, there is no other ground raised by the Appellant to suggest denial of information and as such the PIO cannot be held liable for the same.
9. Therefore, in view of the above the present second appeal is dismissed.

- No order as to cost.
- Parties to be provided authenticated copies of this order separately under each appeal number.
- 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