GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
AT PANAJI

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

Appeal No. 72/SCIC/2010

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

V/s.

1. Public Information Officer,
   James Mathew,
   Town & Country Planning,
   Mapusa - Goa. …… Respondent No.1.
2. First Appellate Authority,
   James Mathew,
   Town & Country Planning ,
   Panaji-Goa. …… Respondent No.2.

Complainant present. Ms. Sonia Satardekar, representative of Complainant present.

Adv. K. L. Bhagat, for the Opponent in person.

O R D E R
(17-08-2010)

1. The Appellant, Shri Kashinath J. Shetye, has preferred this Appeal praying that the information as requested by the Complainant be furnished to him correctly free of cost as per section 7(6); that penalty be imposed on the Public Information Officer/First Appellate Authority as per law for denying the information to the Complainant, that compensation be granted and other reliefs.

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

That the Appellant, vide letter dated 17/11/2009 addressed to the Respondent No.1/Public Information Officer, sought certain information under Right to Information Act 2005('RTI' Act for short). That incomplete information dated 13/01/2010 has been furnished and that some information has not been furnished. That the Appellant preferred the First Appeal, however, certain information has not been furnished. Being aggrieved the Appellant preferred the present appeal on various grounds as set out in the memo of appeal.

3. The Respondents resist the Appeal and their say is on record. It is the case of the Respondent that the application dated 17/11/2009 of the appellant was received

…2/-

by the Respondent No. 1 on 18/12/2009 in the capacity as Public Information Officer.

That by letter dated 13/01/2010 the available information was furnished to the Appellant.

The Respondent has stated in detail that available information has been furnished and whatever is not available cannot be furnished. That the Appellant was called to collect the information after paying the fees but he did not come to collect the same.

4. Heard the Appellant. On the last date Respondent NO. 1 had made submissions.

During the course of his arguments the Appellant submits that he has received the full information and that he has no grievance of whatsoever nature.

5. I have carefully gone through the records of the case and also considered the arguments advanced by the parties.

It is seen that the application dated 17/11/2009 was received on 18/12/2009 as can be seen from the endorsement on the same. Considering the reply dated 13/01/2010 the same is within time. There is no delay as such. The Respondent state that whatever information was available has been furnished.

Appellant on his part has no grievance as complete information has been furnished to him.

6. In view of the above no intervention of this Commission is required. Hence I pass the following order:-

O R D E R

No intervention of this Commission is required. The Appeal is disposed off.

The Appeal is accordingly disposed off.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 17th day of August, 2010.

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