

GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
AT PANAJI

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

Appeal No.194/SCIC/2010

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

...Appellant

V/s

1. The Public Information Officer,
Mapusa Municipal Council ,
Mapusa-Goa.

.... Respondent no.1

2. The First Appellate Authority,
F.A.A. Director of Municipal Administration,
Collectorate Building, Panaji-Goa

...Respondent No.2

Appellant in Person

Respondent No.1 present

Respondent No.2 absent

JUDGEMENT
(09-09-2011)

1. The Appellant, Shri J.T. Shetye has filed the present appeal praying that specific information be provided to him that penalty be imposed on the P.I.O. and disciplinary action be initiated against him.

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

That the Appellant, vide his application dated 27/04/2010 sought certain information under right to information Act (R.T.I. Act for short) from the Public Information officer (P.I.O./Respondent No.1 That the P.I.O. as usual provided information vide his letter dated 26/05/2010 which was incomplete and misleading and therefore the Appellant preferred an Appeal before First Appellate Authority (F.A.A.)/Respondent No.2 That the P.I.O. once again failed to provide information to the Appellant thereby showing disrespect to the order of F.A.A. Hence the present Appeal .

3. In pursuance of the notice Shri Vinay Agarwadekar the representative of the Respondent appeared. The Respondent No.2

filed the reply which is on record . The Respondent No.1 did not file any reply as such.

4. Heard the arguments of the parties and perused the records. The point that arises for my consideration is whether the information is furnished and whether the same is furnished in time.

It is seen that the Appellant sought information vide application dated 27/04/2010. By letter dated 26/05/2010 the information was furnished . According to the Appellant it was misleading. So he preferred the first Appeal. By order dated 25/06/2010, the F.A.A. directed the Respondent no.1 to furnish the fresh information specific to the issue raised by the Appellant within a period of 10 days.

During the course of his arguments the Appellant submits that he has received the information.

5. Since information is furnished no intervention of this Commission is required.

6. Now it is to be seen whether there is delay in furnishing the information . Considering the date of the Application and the reply furnished the same is in time. So there is no question of delay in the instant case.

7. In view of all the above, 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. The Appeal is disposed off.

The Appeal is accordingly disposed off.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 9th day of September, 2011.

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

