

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
AT PANAJI**

CORAM: Shri M. S. Keny, State Chief Information Commissioner

Complaint No. 296/SCIC/2010

Shri Kashinath Shetye,
Bambino Building, Alto-Fondvem,
Ribandar, Tiswadi – Goa.

..... Complainant.

V/s.

Public Information Officer,
Canacona Municipal Council,
Canacona - Goa.

..... Opponent/Respondent.

Complainant in person.

Opponent in person. .

ORDER
(11-08-2010)

1. The Complainant, Shri Kashinath Shetye, has filed this Complaint praying that information as requested be furnished to him correctly free of cost as per section 7(6); that penalty be imposed on the Public Information Officer (P.I.O.) as per law; that compensation be granted as for detriment faced by the Complainant and that inspection of documents may be allowed as per rules.

2. The brief facts leading to the present Complaint are as under:

That the Complainant has filed an application dated 10/02/2010 under Right to Information Act, 2005 ('RTI' Act for short) thereby requesting the P. I. O., Directorate of Municipal Administration, Panaji to issue information specified therein which was transferred u/s. 6(3) to the Opponent. That the PIO/Opponent failed to furnish the required information as per the application of the Complainant and further no inspection of information was allowed. Being aggrieved the Complainant filed the present Complaint on various grounds as set out in the Complaint.

3. The Opponent resists the Complaint and their reply is on record. It is the case of the Opponent that information that was asked was furnished and in respect

...2/-

of point 1 and 12 the certified copies were given. Since certified copies of all were given, there was nothing extra to be inspected and in respect of certain items there were no files to be verified. It is also the case of the Opponent that there is no delay in furnishing the information and only the name of Appellate Authority was not reflected in the reply as the application was addressed to the Public Information Officer, Directorate of Municipal Administration, Panaji and that the same is the Appellate Authority. In short, it is their case that Opponent has furnished the available information.

4. Heard the Complainant as well as the Opponent. I have carefully gone through the records of the case and also considered the arguments advanced. It is to be seen whether the information is furnished or not.

It is seen that Complainant alongwith others, vide application dated 10.02.2010, addressed to P.I.O., Directorate of Municipal Administration, sought certain information. The information pertains to the Opponent. Strangely, application was addressed to the Directorate of Municipal Administration with a request to transfer to the Opponent. By letter dated 11.02.2010 the said application was transferred to the Opponent u/s. 6(3) of RTI Act. By reply dated 10.03.2010 the Opponent furnished the information to all the 12 queries. I have carefully gone through the application as well as replies furnished. It appears that he has fully received the information and that he has no grievance of whatsoever nature against the Opponent.

Since information is furnished, no further intervention of this Commission is required.

6. In view of all above, I pass the following Order:

ORDER

No further intervention of this Commission is required.

Complaint is disposed off.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 11th day of August, 2010.

Sd/-
(M.S. Keny)
State Chief Information Commissioner