

GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

AT PANAJI

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

Complaint No. 87/SIC/2011

Shri Vishnu Mayekar,
R/o. H. No. 567, Tamsoda,
Dharbandora – Goa

...Complainant

V/s

1) Member Secretary,
Goa State Pollution Control Board,
1st Floor, Dempo Tower,
Patto, Panaji – Goa

... Opponent No. 1.

2) Chairman,
Goa State Pollution Control Board,
1st Floor, Dempo Tower,
Patto, Panaji – Goa

... Opponent No. 2.

ORDER
(11.08.2011)

The Complainant, Shri Vishnu Mayekar, has filed the present Complaint praying that the Opponent be penalized as per law and further directed to furnish the information as asked for; that the Opponents be penalized to pay adequate compensation to the Complainant or to send the Opponents to prison.

2. The case of the Complainant is set out in the Complaint. In short, it is the case of the Complainant that Complainant had filed a Complaint before Chairman/Opponent No. 2 on 30.08.2010 regarding large scale of illegal ore handling and stacking in Dharbandora and at Piliem thereby entire people from the village suffered miserably. That after filing of Complaint on 30.08.2010 till 20.10.2010 the Complainant visited the office of Opponent No. 2 more than ten times so as to inquiry about the action taken on his complaint. Further, as there was no sign of giving any attention to the request and despite several visits of the Complainant, got fed up and finally approached the Opponent No. 1 who is the Public Information Officer under Right to Information Act, asking for information. That on 28.12.2010 the Complainant filed application before Opponent No. 1 asking information under Right to Information Act, 2005 ('R.T.I. Act' for short). That information related to the documents of the Complaint dated 30.08.2010,

etc. That a letter dated 18.01.2011 was sent stating about site inspection and that Complainant should remain present on the said date. That thereafter by letter dated 25.01.2011 the Opponent No. 1 intimated the Complainant stating that Complainant will be intimated action taken by Opponent No. 1. That since Opponents started killing time and as the persons involved in the matter are highly influential, in order to avoid further delay, the Complainant again on 28.03.2011 reminded the Opponent No. 1 to issue the information. However, till today it was not issued. Since information was not issued the present Complaint is filed.

It is further the case of the Complainant that the Opponents are deliberately delaying the furnishing of information. Notice was issued to the parties and the matter was posted on 11.08.2011, i.e. today. In pursuance of the notice, Smt. Natalia Dias, Asst. Public Information Officer was present.

3. The Complainant had sent an application dated 08.08.2011 praying that he was withdrawing the Complaint. The said application is on record. It is the case of the Complainant in the said application that after filing the Complaint Opponents have issued the information and, therefore, he is desirous of withdrawing the Complaint. The Complainant prays that he may be permitted to withdraw the Complaint.

4. Since the Complainant wants to withdraw the Complaint on his own, his request is to be granted. He is permitted to withdraw the Complaint. It appears that Complainant is satisfied with the information and that he has no grievance of any sort. Hence, I pass the following Order:-

ORDER

No intervention of this Commission is required as information is furnished. The Complaint is disposed off as withdrawn.

The Complaint is accordingly disposed off.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 11th day of August, 2011.

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

