

GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION AT PANAJI

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

Appeal No. 122/SCIC/2010

Shri Harihar V. Chodankar,
Block a-1, Ground Floor,
Kamat Woods, Pedem, Mapusa,
Bardez - Goa

... Appellant.

V/s.

1) The Public Information Officer,
The Administrator,
Office of the Administrator of Comunidades,
North Zone, Near Mapusa Court,
Mapusa – Goa

... Respondent No.1.

2) First Appellate Authority,
Additional Collector-II,
Collectorate, North Goa,
Panaji – Goa

... Respondent No. 2.

Appellant in person.

Adv. K. H. Bhosale for Respondent No. 1.

J U D G M E N T **(02.05.2011)**

1. The Appellant, Shri Harihar V. Chodankar, has filed the present Appeal praying that information as sought by him be provided to him.

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

That the Appellant, vide application dated 24.12.2009 sought certain information under Right to Information Act, 2005 ('R.T.I. Act' for short) from the Public Information Officer/(P.I.O.)/Respondent No. 1. That by letter dated 22.02.2010 the Respondent No. 1 furnished information at Sr. No. 3(a) of the application and by letter dated 22.02.2010 asked the Registrar/Attorney of Comunidade of Serula to furnish the information as the same was in their possession. That since the information was not furnished the applicant preferred the Appeal before First appellate authority (F.A.A.). By Order dated 09.03.2010 the FAA issued directions to the P.I.O. to furnish the information. Since information has not been furnished the Appellant has preferred the present Appeal. The Respondents resist the Appeal and the reply of the

Respondent is on record. It is the case of Respondent No. 1 that since the information related to Comunidade of Serula the assistance was sought of the Registrar/Attorney of Comunidade under section 5(4) with crystal clear intention to provide the necessary information. That no information was furnished. It is the case of Respondent No. 1 that the Respondent sought assistance of Attorney of Comunidade to provide the necessary information in good faith. According to Respondent No. 1 there was no fault on their part.

3. Heard the Appellant as well as Adv. Shri K. H. Bhosale for Respondent No. 1. It appears that at one stage all the information has been furnished. During the course of arguments Appellant states he has received the information. Appellant also states that he has no grievance of any sort and that he is satisfied with the information.

4. No doubt there is some delay in furnishing the information. However, P.I.O./Respondent No. 1 cannot be blamed for the same as information was not available with him. The Appellant on his part states that he has received the information and that he does not press for penalty, etc. No doubt Respondent No. 1 had to collect information from the Comunidade and then submit the same to the Appellant.

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 since information is furnished. The Appeal is disposed off.

The Appeal is accordingly disposed off.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 02nd day of May, 2011.

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

