

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION  
AT PANAJI**

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

Appeal No. 91/SIC/2009

Mr. Ajit Porob,  
"Shashi Sadan"  
H. No. 133/3, Palmar Pomburpa,  
Bardez – Goa

... Appellant.

V/s.

1) The Superintending Surveyor of Works,  
First Appellate Authority,  
P.W., Altinho,  
Panaji – Goa

... Respondent No. 1

2) The Executive Engineer.  
State Public Information Officer,  
Works Division XVIII (Roads-N),  
P.W.D.,  
Ponda – Goa

... Respondent No. 2.

Shri Rupesh Porob, authorized representative of the Appellant.  
Respondent No. 2 in person.

09.07.2010

**ORDER**

The information sought by the Appellant on 06.01.2010 was replied by the Respondent No. 2 calling upon the Appellant to collect the information on payment of Rs. 150/- and at the same time to furnish identity at the time of payment of charges.

2. The grievance of the Appellant is regarding the Respondent No. 2 requiring proof of identity from the Appellant. It appears that the Appellant issued letter of authority to one Rupesh K. Porob and it was this authorized representative of the Appellant who approached the Respondent No. 2 to collect the information. The information under RTI has to be sought by an individual citizen and as the

...2/-

Appellant gave letter of authority to one Rupesh K. Porob to collect the information, the Respondent No. 2 was justified in informing the Appellant to furnish any identity to collect the information. On the records there is a letter of the Respondent No. 1 dated 23.02.2010 addressed to the Appellant stating that though the application dated 11.02.2010 of the Appellant has stated that a copy of the letter of authority dated 09.01.2010 in the name of Rupesh K. Porob was enclosed alongwith application of First Appeal, no such document has been enclosed alongwith the application dated 11.02.2010 for the First Appeal. This conduct on the part of the Appellant in not producing the letter of authority before the First Appellate Authority was not proper. The Respondent No. 2 was justified in requiring the Appellant to produce any documents showing his identity and collect the information. Since during the hearings in this Appeal the Respondent No. 2 stated that he will provide the information, the Appellant to collect the information from the Respondent No. 2 on payment of necessary charges.

With these observations, the Appeal is disposed off.

Sd/-  
(Afonso Araujo)  
State Information Commissioner

