

GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

AT PANAJI

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

Appeal No.90/SIC/2011

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,
Under Secretary, (GA-II),
Govt. of Goa,
General Administration Dept.,
Secretariat, Porvorim-Goa.

... Respondent no. 1

2. The First Appellate Authority,
Joint Secretary (GA),
Govt. of Goa,
Secretariat, Porvorim-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 information be furnished, that penalty be imposed on the P.I.O.; that disciplinary proceedings be initiated and that compensation be granted to the Appellant.

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

That the complainant, vide his application dated 24/01/2011, 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 Respondent no.1 vide is letter dated 28/01/2011 informed the Appellant to make a payment of Rs. 8/- and collect the information which he collected on 05/02/2011. That being not satisfied the Appellant preferred the Appeal before First Appellate Authority (F.A.A.)/Respondent No.2. The F.A.A. verbally informed the P.I.O. to provide the information on 03/03/2011. That the P.I.O. sent the information by letter dated

03/03/2011. It is the case of the Appellant that he is not satisfied with the information provided firstly because no action taken by the office of Under Secretary GA-II in respect of the Complaint dated 22/04/2010 and secondly the report submitted by Executive Engineer Works Div -I (Bldg.) P.W.D. vide letter dated 21/06/2010 is not correct. Being aggrieved the Appellant has preferred the present appeal.

3. In pursuance of the notice issued the respondent No.1 appeared.

4. Heard both sides and perused the records.

It appears that information asked has been furnished in time. According to the appellant since it was misleading he filed. The Appeal before F.A.A. The F.A.A. directed to furnish the information which P.I.O. did. It appears that information as available has been furnished. Appellant states that he has been also explained about the same.

In view of this position the Appellant state that he has no grievance and that he wants to withdraw the Appeal

5. Since information is furnished no intervention of this Commission is required . The request of the Appellant is to be granted and he is allowed to withdraw the Appeal. 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 9th day of September, 2011.

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