

GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
AT PANAJI

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

Appeal 244/SIC/2010

Smt. Audrey S. Dias e Rodrigues,
Velsao Pale,
Mormugao-Goa

... Appellant.

V/s

1) The Secretary,
V.P. Velsao Pale,
Mormugao-Goa

... Respondent No.1.

2) The Block Development Office,
Mormugao Block,
Vasco-da-Gama.

...Respondent No.2.

Appellant in Person
Respondent No.1 present
Respondent No.2 absent

JUDGEMENT

(21/06/2011)

1. The Appellant, Smt Audrey S. Dias e. Rodrigues, has filed the present appeal praying that the Respondent No.1 be directed to provide the information free of cost; that the Respondent No.1 be directed to pay the fine i.e maximum penalty and that disciplinary proceedings be initiated against Respondent No.1 for harassing the Appellant.

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

That the Appellant had filed 9 applications dated 15/02/2010, seeking 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 the Respondent No.1 failed to furnish the information within the stipulated period of 30 days. That the Respondent No.1 refused to give information on one pretext or the other. That the Appellant preferred the appeal

before the First Appellate Authority (F.A.A.) /Respondent No.2
That the F.A.A./Respondent No.2 by order dated 27/09/2010
directed the Respondent no.1 to provide the detailed
information to the Appellant within seven days from the order .
That despite the said order the respondent No.1 did not provide
the information instead wrote a letter to the Appellant to
deposit an amount of Rs. 8380/- as estimated cost of the said
information. Being aggrieved the Appellant has preferred the
present appeal.

3. The Respondent no.1 resists the appeal and the reply is
on the records . It is the case of the Respondent No.1 that the
purported second appeal is mischievous and untenable in law,
so much so that this respondent has neither rejected the
request nor refused the information as sought. That the main
grievance of the Appellant appears to be that she wanted the
information free of cost. That the Appellant has illegally
constructed a compound wall blocking the access of the
villagers, for which demolition order has been issued against
her and she has filed an appeal before the Dy Director of
Panchayat, which is pending. That to side track the demolition
order, with malicious aim, she has filed nine applications and
that too without giving details of files, the information from 89
disposed files some of which are five years old. That the
Appellant was duly notified to deposit Rs. 8380/- being the
estimated cost of furnishing the information and other records
of third party. That information sought is voluminous and
involves lot of money. That in order to cover up her own lapse
for not coming to collect the information and to pay the
required fees the Appellant has made nasty and false personal
allegations. That First Appellate Authority has not directed to
furnish information free of cost.

4. Heard the arguments. Written arguments of Appellant as well as Respondent No.1 are on record.

5. During the course of the arguments the Appellant submits that she has received the information. She is satisfied with the same and that she has no grievance of any sort. According to her information has been provided free of cost.

6. No doubt there is some delay in furnishing information. It is to be noted that information was vast and xeroxing facility was not available. Besides information has been furnished free of cost. In view of this delay, if any, is to be condoned.

7. 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. Appeal is disposed off.

The Appeal is accordingly disposed off.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 21st day of June 2011.

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

