

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
AT PANAJI**

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

Appeal No. 144/SCIC/2011

Shri Shamsundar V. Kerkar,
H. No. 1152, Bagwada,
Morjim,
Pednem - Goa Appellant

V/s.

- 1) Mr. Laxaman Parsekar,
Public Information Officer,
Secretary,
Village Panchayat Anjuna Caisua,
Bardez - Goa Respondent No. 1.
- 2) First Appellate Authority,
Mr. Shivprasad Naik,
Block Development Officer at Mapusa,
Mapusa - Goa Respondent No. 2.

Appellant in person.

Respondent No. 1 alongwith his representative, Shri S. Porob.

JUDGMENT
(22.09.2011)

1. The Appellant, Shri Shamsunder V. Kerkar, has filed the present Appeal praying that the Public Information Officer be directed to provide all the information sought in the initial application within a week; that the same be provided free of cost as per section 7(6) of the RTI Act and that penalty be imposed on the Public Information Officer under section 20 of the RTI Act.

2. It is the case of the Appellant that the Appellant vide application dated 25.02.2011 sought certain information under Right to Information Act, 2005 ('RTI Act' for short) from the Public Information Officer (PIO)/Respondent No. 1. That the Respondent No. 1 provided the information however the same is not directly pertaining to the information which is asked and that the same is incomplete and misleading. Being not satisfied the Appellant

preferred First Appeal however by Order dated 03.06.2011 the Appeal was dismissed. Being aggrieved by the said Order the Appellant has preferred the present Appeal.

3. Respondent No. 1 resists the Appeal and the reply of the Respondent No. 1 is on record. It is the case of Respondent No. 1 that application seeking information was received and that the Respondent No. 1 has already provided information to the Appellant which was available on the record of the Panchayat. That the Respondent no. 1 asked the Appellant to pay the required fees and collect the information vide letter dated 23.03.2011. That accordingly the Appellant collected the information. That thereafter the Appellant preferred the Appeal before the First Appellate Authority (FAA)/Respondent No. 2. That in the said appeal the Respondent No. 1 once again informed the Appellant that the information sought at Sr. No. 1 and 2 is not available with Panchayat office and the copies/documents already provided vide letter dated 26.03.2011 are the only documents which form the record of the Panchayat. It is further the case of the Respondent No. 1 that he acted within four corners of law and that the Appeal be dismissed.

4. Heard both sides and perused the records.

It is seen that the Appellant vide application dated 25.02.2011 sought certain information. It is seen that by reply dated 23.03.2011 the said information was furnished. Being not satisfied the Appellant preferred Appeal, however the Appeal was dismissed. It appears that available information has been furnished. The only grievance of the Appellant appears that information is incomplete. During the course of the hearing the Appellant submits that he has received full information. He is satisfied with the same and that he has no grievance of any sort.

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 as information is furnished. The Appeal is disposed off.

The Appeal is accordingly disposed off.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 22nd day of September, 2011.

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

