

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
AT PANAJI**

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

Complaint No. 552/SCIC/2010

Mr. Kiru S. Porob,,
Draftsman Civil Grade III,
WD.XVII(PHE-N),
PWD, 50 MLD WTP,
Assonora –Goa.

... Complainant

V/s

State Public Information Officer,
The Executive Engineer,
WD.XVII (PHE-N),
PWD,
Porvorim –Goa.

... Opponent.

Complainant absent. His representative also absent.
Opponent present. Adv. K. L. Bhagat for the opponent present.

O R D E R
(17/01/2011)

The complainant, Shri Kiru S. Porob, has filed the present complaint praying that records and proceeding be called for; that opponent be directed to furnish the information as per application dated 11/03/2010 free of charge and that opponent be held under disciplinary action and penalty be imposed upon the opponent.

2. It is the case of the Complainant that complainant vide his application dated 11/03/2010 sought certain information under Right to Information Act 2005('RTI' Act for short) from the Public Information Officer (PIO)/Opponent. That the opponent did not furnish any information within statutory period and hence the present complaint.

3. The case of the opponent is set out in the reply. It is the case of the Opponent that application seeking information was received on 11/03/2010 that there was some delay in processing the same and that now the information has been furnished.

...2/-

4. Heard shri Rupesh Porob the representative of the Complainant and Adv. Shri K. L Bhagat for the opponent and perused the records.

It is seen that the complainant has sought certain information vide his application dated 11/03/2010 the information related to the employees under the Division office of the Opponent. During the course of the argument the representative of the Complainant submitted that the Complainant has received full information and that he has no grievance and that he is fully satisfied with the information.

5. Admittedly, there is some delay in furnishing the information. No doubt, information appears to be regarding the employee of the division. As per the opponent that the application was transferred to the concerned APIO as well as dealing official and on account of this was some delay. It is also submitted by opponent that memorandum was issued to the Official as part of lapse on their part. Since action has been taken it would not be proper again to penalize the officer. The Complainant has no grievance in any case. The opponent to complete the action as they already issued memorandum to the concerned official.

6. Since information is furnished, no intervention of this Commission is 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.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 17th day of January, 2011.

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

