GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION AT PANAJI

CORAM: Shri Afonso Araujo, State Information Commissioner

Complaint No.46/SIC/2010

Shri Prabhakar S. yende, Kesarvaddo, Khorlim Mapusa – Goa

... Complainant.

V/s.

Public Information Officer, Chief Officer, Mapusa Municipal Council Mapusa – Goa

... Opponent.

Complainant alongwith his authorized representative Shri K. Shetye. Opponent absent.

Dated: 21.05.2010

<u>ORDER</u>

By Judgment dated 01.12.2009 passed in Appeal No. 31/SCIC/2009 this Commission directed the Complainant to approach with whatever documents the Opponent the Complainant has, to enable the Opponent to provide information at Sr. No. 2, 3 and 4 of the request dated 15.01.2009. The grievance of the Complaint in this Complaint is that inspite of the fact that the Complainant produced whatever documents he has to the Opponent, the Order dated 01.12.2009 was not complied with.

2. The Opponent in the reply dated 18.03.2010 has stated that after receiving the letter from the Complainant a personal hearing was called where the Complainant and one Mr. Nasnodkar were present and it was revealed that the Complainant had handed over the possession of stall No. 245 to Ganshyam Nasnodkar and accordingly the agreement was executed between the Respondent (M.M.C.) and Mr. Ganashyam Nasnodkar on 21.10.1997 regarding

reconstruction of stall No. 245 and accordingly the sum of Rs. 70,000/- was to be paid by Ganashyam Nasnodkar towards the construction of re-construction and a sum of Rs. 25,000/- was paid by the said Nasnodkar to the contractor and that the Complainant has sworn an affidavit on 25.10.2008 duly executed before the Notary, Mapusa wherein he has stated that he does not have any Municipal stall/shop in his name and that the Opponent by communication dated 06.02.2009 provided the information to item No. 1 to 9 to the request dated 15..01.2009 and also by letter dated 17.03.2010 has informed the Complaint that the Opponent does not have any other documents.

3. There is nothing on record to counter the contention of the Opponent either by way of counter-reply or any documentary evidence denying the averments made by the Opponent in his reply dated 18.03.2010 specially to the fact that there is an affidavit of the Complainant stating that the Complainant does not have any Municipal stall/shop in his name.

In such circumstances there is no need to proceed further and the Complaint is disposed off.

Sd/(Afonso Araujo)
State Information Commissioner