

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION  
AT PANAJI**

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

Appeal No. 71/SIC/2011

Prashant Tari,  
Desai Residency, Flat No. AS-3,  
Near Electricity Department,  
Haveli, Curti,  
Ponda - Goa .... Appellant

V/s.

1) Public Information Officer,  
Headmistress,  
Gujarati Samaj Educational  
Trust For the Handicapped,  
Aquem, Nr. Maruti Temple,  
Margao - Goa .... Respondent No. 1.

2) Public Information Officer,  
Directorate of Education,  
Panaji - Goa .... Respondent No. 2.

Appellant in person.  
Respondent No. 1 in person.

**J U D G M E N T**  
**(12.09.2011)**

1. The Appellant, Shri Prashant Tari, has filed the present Appeal praying that the Respondents be directed to provide correct and complete answer to the query at para 4 and 5 of his application dated 20.05.2010 and that penalty in terms of section 20 of RTI Act be imposed.

2. In short it is the case of the Appellant that the Appellant, vide his application dated 20.05.2010, sought certain information under Right to Information Act, 2005 ('R.T.I. Act' for short) from the Public Information Officer (PIO)/Respondent No. 2. That the Respondent No. 2 marked the said application to the Respondent No. 1 and the copy of the same was sent to the Appellant. That it was informed to the Appellant to collect the copies from the concerned school on payment of necessary charges. That the Appellant was furnished the copies only on 17.07.2010 in respect of the first three points. That

the information received from the Respondent no. 1 is not correct and he is not the PIO. That the information furnished by PIO, Headmistress, Gujarati Samaj Educational Trust is false and misleading. Being not satisfied the Appellant preferred the First Appeal. That the same was allowed and PIO was directed to furnish the information within five days. Since information has not been furnished the Appellant has preferred the present Appeal.

3. The Respondent No. 1 has filed the reply which is on record. In short, it is the case of Respondent No. 1 that the Appeal is misconceived and bad in law. That the information was duly furnished. Respondent No. 1 also refers to the Appeal preferred, etc. in detail. Respondent No. 1 also states about signing the information furnished. According to the Respondent Appeal is liable to be dismissed.

4. During the course of hearing today the Appellant filed an application stating that he wants to withdraw the Appeal.

5. Since the Appellant is satisfied his request is to be granted. Hence, I pass the following Order:-

### **ORDER**

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

The Appeal is accordingly disposed off.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 12<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2011.

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





