

Officer(PIO)/Respondent No. 1. That the Appellant received information from the Public Information Officer by letter dated 30.08.2010 which was not to the satisfaction of the Appellant. Hence, the Appellant preferred Appeal before First Appellate Authority. By Order dated 23.09.2010 the Appeal was dismissed. Being aggrieved by the said Order the Appellant has preferred the present Appeal.

3. In pursuance of notice the Respondents appeared. The Respondent did not file any reply as such. However, the Respondent No. 1/Public Information Officer remained present and advanced arguments.

4. Heard the Complainant as well as Respondent No. 1.

5. I have carefully gone through the records of the case and also considered the arguments advanced by the parties. It is seen that the Appellant sought certain information by his application dated 11.08.2010. The Respondent by letter dated 30.08.2010 furnished the information. This letter is in time. Being not satisfied the Appellant preferred the Appeal before the First Appellate Authority/Respondent No. 2. It is seen that by Order dated 23.09.2010 the Appeal was dismissed,

During the course of arguments Appellant submitted that correct information has been furnished to him. He is satisfied with the same and that he has no grievance of any sort.

5. Since information has been 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 already furnished. The Appeal is disposed off.

The Appeal is accordingly disposed off.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 24th day of May, 2011.

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