

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
AT PANAJI**

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

Complaint No.589/SCIC/2010

Shri Rohidas R. Dessai,
108, Ritz Classic Restaurant,
Vagle Vision, 18th June Road,
Panaji – Goa

... Complainant

V/s

1. The Executive Engineer (Trg) and S.P.I.O.
C.E.E.'s Office, Electricity Department,
Government of Goa
Vidyut Bhavan, Panaji-Goa
2. The Executive Engineer, S.P.I.O.,
Electricity Dept., Div.I, Panaji
3. The Assistant Public Information Officer,
Sub Divisional Engineer,
Sub Div.II(U), Panaji-Goa
4. The Executive Engineer,
COM Section, C.E.E.'s Office, Panaji-Goa
5. The Assistant Public Information Officer,
Sub Divisional Engineer,
Sub Div.I, II(U), III, IV.
Corlim, Panaji, Bambolim, Taleigao
6. The Assistant Public Information Officer,
Assistant Executive Engineer,
Sub Div-IV, Taleigao,
7. The Assistant Executive Engineer,
Electricity Dept., Sub Div.III(R), Bambolim
8. The Executive Engineer (SPIO),
Electricity Div. Margao-Goa
9. The Executive Engineer,
Electricity Div., Ponda, Goa
10. The State Assistant Public Information Officer,
Sub Divisional Engineer,
Electricity Dept., Sub Div.I, II, III,
Curti, Ponda-Goa
11. The Executive Engineer(SPIO),
Electricity Div. Bicholim-Goa
12. The Executive Engineer (SPIO),
Electricity Div., Mapusa-Goa,
13. The Executive Engineer (SPIO),
Electricity Div. Curchorem
14. The Asst.Executive Engineer/Asst. Engineer,
Elect-VII,
Sub Div & Tech. Section, Curchorem-Goa
15. The Executive Engineer(SPIO),
Electricity Div.XI, Vasco

... Respondents

Complainant absent. His adv. B. Prabhudessai present
Respondent present.

ORDER
(11/11/2011)

1. The Complainant, Shri Rohidas R. Dessai, has filed present complaint praying that the respondents be directed to provide correct information by way of single window i.e. office of respondent No.1. That the respondent be penalized to the maximum extent for their bad action, and that compensation of Rs.10,000/- be granted.

2. It is the case of the complainant that the complainant, vide his application dated 24/09/2010 sought certain information under Right to Information Act, 2005 ('R.T.I.' Act for short) from the Public Information Officer (P.I.O.)/Office of the Chief Electrical Engineer, Vidyut Bhavan, Panaji. That the information consisted of 47 items i.e. point at Sr. No.1 to 47. That the application was entertained by respondent No.1 and that the respondent No.1 transferred the said application to the Executive Engineer, SPIO/respondent No.2. It appears the application was subsequently transferred to various P.I.O.s. That information was furnished from time to time by said P.I.O.s. It is the case of the complainant that the respondents have intentionally failed and has neglected to provide correct information to the respondent within stipulated period of 30 days. That part of the information provided is incorrect, misleading and with intention to cover up the mistake. That being the same department, the information should be collected by respondent No.1 from the other respondents and provided to the complainant by way of single window. That the complainant is entitled for the compensation of Rs.10,000/- for the harassment caused.

3. The respondent resists the application and the reply of the respondent No.2 and 3 are on record. In short, it is the case of the respondent No.2 that the present complaint is false, baseless and without any cause of action. That the complainant has admitted that the respondent No.2 has complied which is part of furnished information

that was within his knowledge and authority. That no relief is sought against respondent No.2. That the present complaint is liable to be dismissed for non joinder of the necessary parties. That the information sought by the complainant is vague and without any specific reference and that complainant himself is not clear as to what information he wants. That the questions and information related to the policy matters of the department and some general information not related to the sub divisional office. The respondent admits of calling the complainant etc in the reply. In short it is case of the respondent No.2 that the information was sought by the appellant was kept for verification and inspection of information which could be practically given was furnished to the complainant within prescribed time frame. That the complainant was given many opportunities for verifying and inspecting records kept at various Sub Divisional Offices. However complainant never availed the opportunity or approached the concerned Sub Divisional Office. That the complaint is filed with sole motive and malafide intention of harassing and pressurizing the respondent.

According to the respondent No.2, complaint is liable to be dismissed.

4. The detail reply of respondent No.3 is also on record. The same is in similar vein.

5. The matter proceeded and was fixed for argument of the parties. From the pleading of the parties, it appears that information has been furnished and inspection has been offered. However as the case set out by the complainant, it appears that some of the information is incorrect and misleading. Advocate Shri B. Pranhudesai filed an application dated 10/11/2011 stating that complaint was filed for non furnishing of information and misleading information and that matter has been settled and complainant wants to withdraw the complaint.

6. It is seen from the records that most of the information has been furnished and the question to be determined was about misleading and incorrect information. Since the complainant himself states that the same issue is settled, the request to withdraw the complaint is to be granted. Hence I pass the following order.

ORDER

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

The Complaint is accordingly disposed off.

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

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