

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
AT PANAJI**

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

Comp. 477/SCIC/2010

Mr. J. T. Shetye,
C/o. Mapusa Jana Jagruti Samiti,
H. No. 35, Ward No. 11,
Khorlim,
Mapusa - Goa

... Complainant.

V/s.

Public Information Officer,
Mamlatdar of Bardez,
Mapusa – Goa

... Opponent.

Complainant in person.
Opponent in person.

ORDER
(13.07.2011)

1. The Complainant, Shri J. T. Shetye, has filed the present Complaint praying that Opponent be directed to provide correct information to the point No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 and 10; that penalty be imposed and that disciplinary proceedings action be initiated against Mamlatdar of Bardez for persistently providing incorrect and misleading information.

2. It is the case of the Complainant that vide application dated 10.06.2010 he sought certain information under the Right to Information Act, 2005 ('R.T.I. Act' for short) from the Opponent/Public Information Officer (PIO). That the Opponent, vide letter dated 10.07.2010 has provided the information. That the letter was received by the Complainant on 17.07.2010 by post. It is the case of the Complainant that the PIO has provided information in respect of some points to his satisfaction and malafidely denied the request for information in respect of some other

points. It is further the case of the Complainant that the PIO has knowingly provided incorrect, incomplete and misleading information and hence, the present Complaint. The case of the Opponent is fully set out in the reply which is on record. In short, it is the case of the Opponent that the Complainant has filed an application dated 10.06.2010 seeking information in respect of Land Revenue Appeal filed by Gunaji M. Pednekar before Hon'ble Administrative Tribunal. That their office vide letter dated 10.07.2010 has replied to all the information sought by the Complainant. That the Complainant being unsatisfied inspite of preferring First Appeal has filed the present Complaint which is not maintainable under the Act. The Opponent denies that the Opponent has malafidely denied the request for information of the Complainant. That the copies of parawise comments is not available in the file. That in respect of point No. 2 and 3 Opponent states that once the Government Advocate appointed in the matter, it is the duty of the Government Advocate to appear in the matter and inform the outcome of this case in the office. Regarding point No. 6, 8 and 9 the information is not available in their office and that the Complainant was informed accordingly. According to him Complaint is liable to be dismissed.

3. Heard the arguments of the Complainant and the Opponent and also perused the records. It is seen that the Complainant sought certain information vide letter dated 10.06.2010. Vide reply dated 10.07.2010 the Opponent furnished the information sought.

4. I have perused the application in detail as well as the reply furnished.

During the course of arguments the Complainant states that information has been furnished and in view of this, he does not wish to proceed with the matter.

5. 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. The Complaint is disposed off.

The Complaint is accordingly disposed off

Pronounced in the Commission on this 13th day of July, 2011.

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