## GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION AT PANAJI

**CORAM:** Shri Afonso Araujo, State Information Commissioner

Appeal No. 149/SIC/2009

Mr. E. Amaral, H. No. 1022(2), Socorro Zosvaddo, Bardez, <u>Goa – 403 501</u>

... Appellant.

V/s.

 Public Information Officer, Mamlatdar of Bardez, Office of Mamlatdar, Mapusa, <u>Bardez – Goa</u>

... Respondent No. 1.

 The First Appellate Authority, Dy. Collector & S.D.O. of Bardez, Mapusa Sub Division, Mapusa, <u>Bardez – Goa</u>

... Respondent No. 2.

Appellant alongwith Adv. V. Gaitonde. Respondent No. 1 in person. Authorised representative of Respondent No. 2.

## <u>J U D G M E N T</u>

(Per Afonso Araujo)

By request dated 03.09.2009 the Appellant sought information under RTI Act and requires to know whether the name of Clovis Pinto was deleted and the name of Jose Furtado and Flavia D'souza has been substituted in its place in Mutation proceedings 255 and 472 respectively. The Respondent No. 1 by communication dated 09.10.2009 provided Xerox copies of Mutation Case No. 472 and on 04.11.2009 the Respondent No. 1 provided the information in respect of Mutation Case No. 255. Not satisfied with the information provided the Appellant preferred the First Appeal and the First Appellate Authority by

...2/-

Order dated 02.12.2009 dismissed the Appeal on the ground that the information in respect of Mutation Case No. 255 and 472 has been provided to the Appellant. The Appellant preferred the Second Appeal on the ground that the copies of the Mutation Case No. 255 have not been furnished to the Appellant.

2. The records indicate that initially the Respondent No. 1 provided the information in respect of Mutation Case No. 472 and subsequently the information in respect of Mutation Case No. 255. The Appellant has not indicated in what manner he is not satisfied with the information provided in respect of Mutation Case No. 255 and since the information has been provided to the Appellant by communication dated 09.10.2009 and 04.11.2009, rightly the First Appellate Authority dismissed the First Appeal. There are no reasons for interference with the Order of the First Appellate Authority. Hence, the following Order:

## <u>O R D E R</u>

The Appeal is dismissed.

Pronounced on this 11<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2010.

Sd/-(Afonso Araujo) State Information Commissioner