

GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

AT PANAJI

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

Appeal No.31/SCIC/2011

Mr. Cyril Fernandes,
Attorney to Vermon Fonseca,
405,B,Lokhandwala Complex
"Symphony" Andhari , Mumbai.

... Appellant.

V/s

1) The Public Information Officer,
O/o Asst Engineer,
Electricity Dept.,
Vidyut Bhavan,
Mapusa.

... Respondent No.1.

2) The First Appellate Authority,
O/O Supdt. Engineer,Circle No. II (N),
Vidyut Bhavan,Panaji –Goa.

... Respondent No.2.

Appellant in person.

Shri Kashinath Shetye representative of Respondent No. 1 and 2.

J U D G E M E N T
(31/03/2011)

1. The Appellant, Cyril Fernandes, the constituted attorney of Vermon Fonseca, has filed the present Appeal praying that Assistant Engineer Mr. Chacko C has issued false information and that he may be suitably punished.

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

That the Appellant, vide his application dated 21/10/2010, sought certain information under Right to information Act 2005('RTI' Act for short) from the Respondent No. 1/Public Information Officer (PIO). That the Appellant received a reply dated 11/11/2010 asking some clarification. That since no reply was received he filed the Appeal before First Appellate Authority/Respondent No. 2. That by order dated 10/12/2010 the appeal was disposed off and on the same day the information was furnished to him free of cost. It is the case of the Appellant that the information furnished was incomplete and tampered with and as such he preferred the present appeal on various grounds as set out in the memo of Appeal.

...2/-

3. The Respondents resist the Appeal and their say is on record. It is the case of Respondent No. 1 that since no power-of-attorney was attached with the application they sought some clarification by letter dated 11/11/2010. But nothing was heard by the Appellant. That subsequently by letter dated 19/11/2010, the Respondent No.1 intimated the Appellant to collect the information by paying necessary fee, however, the same was posted on 24/11/2010 due to some administrative difficulties. That as per order passed by F.A.A. the Respondent No. 1 furnished the information free of cost.

The Respondent No. 2 in his reply states about receiving the appeal, hearing the same and also about order passed.

4. Heard the Appellant and the Respondent No. 1 alongwith his representative Shri K. Shetye.

During the course of his arguments the Appellant states that information is furnished he is satisfied with the same and that he has no grievance of any sort.

5. I have perused the records. It is seen that by letter dated 11/11/2010 the Appellant was called to seek some clarification but it appears that he did not go. Again by letter dated 19/11/2010 the Appellant was called to pay certain amount. However the said letter was posted on 24/11/2010. It is seen that in between Appeal was filed and information was furnished. The application dated 21/10/2010 was received on 22/10/2010 and letter to collect was sent on 24/11/2010. There is hardly delay of two days. In any case information is furnished free of cost and as such this delay is to be condoned.

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 as information is furnished. The Appeal is disposed off.

The appeal is accordingly disposed off.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 31st day of March ,2011.

Sd/-
(M. S. Keny)
State Information Commission

