

# **GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION AT PANAJI**

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

Appeal No. 6/SCIC/2011

Shri J. T. Shetye,  
H. No. .35, Ward No. 11,  
Khorlim-Mapusa,  
Bardez - Goa

.... Appellant

V/s

1) Public Information Officer,  
State Registrar-cum-Head of Notary Services,  
Shrama Shakti Bhavan, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor,  
Patto, Panaji - Goa

... Respondent No. 1.

2) First Appellate Authority,  
Law Secretary,  
Government of Goa,  
Secretariat,  
Porvorim - Goa

... Respondent No. 2.

Appellant in person.

Adv. Smt. H. Naik for Respondent No. 1.

## **J U D G M E N T** **(14.06.2011)**

1. The Appellant, Shri J. T. Shetye, has filed the present appeal praying for a direction to First Appellate Authority to abide by the provision of RTI Act; that Public Information Officer be directed to provide correct information to all his three applications and that penalty be imposed on the Public Information Officer and disciplinary action be initiated.

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

That the Appellant, vide his three applications dated 17.09.2010, 17.09.2010 and 07.10.2010 sought certain information under Right to Information Act, 2005 ('R.T.I. Act' for short) from the Public Information Officer(PIO)/Respondent No. 1. That the PIO did not provide the information within the stipulated period of thirty days

and, therefore, the Appellant preferred First Appeal before First Appellate Authority(FAA). That the matter was heard on 09.11.2010, 23.11.2010 and 25.11.2010 before Respondent No. 2 and was kept for Order on 25.11.2010. That the Appellant did not receive copy of the Order so far. Being aggrieved the Appellant has preferred the present Appeal.

3. In pursuance of the notice Adv. Smt. H. Naik appeared on behalf of Respondent No. 1. Respondent did not file any reply as such.

4. Heard the Appellant and also Advocate for Respondent No. 1 and perused the records. It is seen that Appellant had filed three applications seeking information. From the records it is seen that information has been furnished by letter dated 15.10.2010 and 04.11.2010. During the course of arguments Appellant states that he does not wish to proceed further. Appellant prays that he may be permitted to withdraw the Appeal.

5. As observed above, information appears to have been furnished. It is seen that PIO has also expired as stated by the parties. In any case request is to be granted and Appellant is to be permitted to withdraw the Appeal. Hence, I pass the following Order:-

### **ORDER**

No intervention of this Commission is required. The Appeal is disposed as withdrawn.

The Appeal is, accordingly, disposed off.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 14<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2011.

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



