

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
AT PANAJI**

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

Complaint No. 515/SCIC/2010

Smt. Teresa Dinesh Vaghela,
Major, resident of Navegauri Apartments,
IIInd flr, Opp.ICICI ATM,
Alto Porvorim –Goa.

... Complainant

V/s

The Public Information Officer &
Jt. Director of Accounts,
Dte. Of Accounts,
Panaji –Goa.

... Opponent

Complainant in person.
Opponent in person..
Adv. N. Dias for Opponent person.

O R D E R
(06/12/2010)

1. The Complainant, Smt. Teresa Dinesh Vaghela, has filed this Complaint praying that the Opponent be directed to provide the complainant complete and correct information sought by her vide her application dated 19/10/2009; that the Opponent may be punished in accordance with the Right to Information Act and that necessary action be taken under section 20(2) against the Public Information Officer for not implementing the said State Information Commission's order and a fine of Rs. 25,000/- also be imposed on the Public Information Officer and that compensation may be awarded to the Complainant.

2. The brief facts leading to the present Complaint are as under that the Complainant, vide her application dated 19/10/2009 sought certain information from the Opponent under the Right to Information Act 2005(RTI Act for short). That the Complainant received a letter dated 21/10/2009 from the Opponent by post informing that Opponent is not responsible to provide this information. That the Complainant made an appeal before the First Appellate Authority and during the course of hearing the Public Information Officer provided part of the information. That more than 45 days passed and the complainant has not received any further information or no order from the FAA and hence the Complainant preferred the

...2/-

second appeal. That Goa State Information Commission passed an order dated 28/06/2010 in appeal No. 150/SIC/2009 and directed the PIO, Director of Accounts, Panaji, the Opponent herein to provide information at Sr. No. 6 to 7 of the request dated 19/10/2009 in the same form as were provided within the period of 15 days from the date of receipt of this order and report compliance. That the Complainant received a few Xerox copies. That the information provided is vague and incomplete and not as per the order of the Commission. It is the case of the Complainant that the Opponent has deliberately and with malafide intentions withheld the disclosure and hence the present Complaint.

3. The Opponent resists the complaint and the reply of the Opponent is on record. It is the case of the opponent that whatever information available in the office has been furnished to the Complainant vide letter dated 21/10/2009. That the order of the Commission dated 28/06/2010 has been complied with immediately by furnishing information as directed by the Commission there and then only. That all the information sought by the Complainant has been provided and this fact has been admitted by the Complainant in para 7 of the Complaint. That if the complainant desires to have additional copies than the opponent is willing to provide the same. In short it is the case of the opponent that the order dated 28/06/2010 has been complied and the question of malafide and deliberate intention does not arise. That the provisions of RTI Act has been fulfilled and the Complaint is liable to be dismissed.

4. Heard Shri Vaghela, representing the Complainant and Adv. N. Dias for the Opponent. I have carefully gone through the records of the case and also considered the arguments advanced by the parties. It is seen that by order dated 28/06/2010 in appeal No. 150/SCIC/09 this Commission directed Respondent No. 1 to provide information at Sr. No. 6 and 7 of the request dated 19/10/2009 in the same form as was provided in the annexure to the letter of the Respondent No. 1

dated 20/11/2009. It was also directed that information may be furnished within 15 days. During the course of arguments Shri Vaghela representative of the Complainant states that complainant has received full information. That the complainant is fully satisfied with the same and that complainant has no grievance.

Since information is furnished the intervention of this Commission is not required and hence I pass the following order.

O R D E R

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

The Complaint is accordingly disposed off.

Pronounced in this Commission on this 6th December, 2010.

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

