

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
AT PANAJI**

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

Complaint No. 386/SCIC/2010

Dr. Ketan S. Govekar,
R/o. Wadji Building,
St. Inez,
Tiswadi – Goa

..... Complainant.

V/s.

1) Public Information Officer,
Mr. Edwin Cortez,
Dhempe College of Arts & Science,
Miramar,
Panaji – Goa

..... Opponent No. 1.

2) First Appellate Authority,
Dr. S. V. Deshpande
Dhempe College of Arts & Science,
Miramar, Panaji – Goa

.... Opponent No. 2.

Complainant in person.
Opponent No. 1 in person.
Opponent No. 2 absent.

ORDER
(07-12-2010)

1. The Complainant, Dr. Ketan S. Govekar, has filed the present Complaint praying that the information as requested by the Complainant be furnished to him; that penalty be imposed on Public Information Officer as per law for denying the information to the Complainant and that compensation be granted as for the detriment faced by the Complainant.
2. It is the case of the Complainant that vide his application dated 21.01.2010 he sought certain information under Right to Information Act, 2005 ('RTI' Act for short) from the Public Information Officer/PIO/Opponent No. 1. That the Opponent No. 1 failed to furnish the required information as per the

...2/-

application of the Complainant. That being not satisfied Complainant preferred First Appeal before the Opponent No. 2. That the Opponent No. 2 while passing the Order dated 09.03.2010 has failed to fix the period within which the Public Information Officer has to furnish the information to the Complainant. That the same is in violation of the provisions of RTI Act. Being aggrieved the Complainant has preferred the present Complaint on various grounds as set out in the said Complainant.

3. The Opponent resists the Complaint and the written statement of Opponent No. 1 is on record. It is the case of Opponent No. 1 that information has been furnished to the Complainant. The Opponent has also submitted an application dated 07.12.2010 stating that all information has been provided to the Complainant.
4. Heard the Complainant as well as the Opponent No. 1 and perused the records. It is seen that Complainant has filed application dated 21.01.2010 seeking certain information from Opponent No. 1. The information consist of 54 points, i.e. Sr. No. 1 to 54. It is the contention of the Opponent No. 1 that information has been furnished. I have perused the Order at page No. 5 of the First Appellate Authority. It is observed that information was dispatched but not received. It is also observed that Public Information Officer furnished a copy of information sought.

During the course of the arguments Complainant submitted that he has received full information. He is fully satisfied with the same and that he has no grievance of any sort.

5. Since information is furnished no intervention of this Commission is required.

Hence, I pass the following Order:

ORDER

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

The Complaint is disposed off accordingly.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 07th day of December, 2010.

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

