

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
AT PANAJI**

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

Complaint No.85/SCIC/2011

Shri Shrikant Navelkar,
Khalap Waddo,
Canca, Bardez-Goa.

... Complainant

V/s

The Public Information Officer,
Block Development Officer,
Mapusa - Goa.

... Opponent

Complainant present.

Opponent present.

ORDER

(09/11/2011)

1. The Complainant, Shri Shrikant Navelkar, has filed the present complaint praying that the opponent be directed to furnish the information and to impose the penalty on the concerned authority for not providing the information.

2. It is the case of the complainant that he filed an application dated 10/01/2011, seeking certain information under Right to Information Act, 2005 ('R.T.I. Act for short) from the Public Information Officer (P.I.O.)/Opponent. That even after lapse of time, the opponent did not provide the information. Being not satisfied, the complainant preferred appeal before the First Appellate Authority (FAA) on 28/2/2011. That vide order dated 08/03/2011, the F.A.A. instructed the P.I.O. to provide the information within 10 days from the receipt of the order. That even after lapse of 10 days, the P.I.O. did not bother to provide the information. Being aggrieved the complainant has filed the present complaint.

3. The case of the opponent is fully set out in the reply which is on record. In short, it is the case of the opponent that application seeking information was received and that information was furnished vide letter dated 14/1/2011. That the opponent came to know about the order on

17/5/2011. That the opponent has furnished the information within 10 days from the date of knowledge of order of F.A.A. It is also the case of the opponent that the present complaint is a result of confusion of the complainant. That there were two applications made to the opponent dated 10/1/2011 and the other dated 31/1/2011 and the reply of these two applications have been interchanged during the proceeding with the F.A.A. and this has led to passing of order of F.A.A. wherein directions have been issued to the opponent. That the complainant is aware that the information is furnished to him but has deliberately preferred the complaint. It is further the case of the opponent that there is no delay in furnishing the information. According to the opponent, the complaint be dismissed.

4. Heard the complainant and perused the records. It is seen that application seeking information was filed on 10/01/2011. It is seen from the reply of the opponent that letter dated 14/01/2011 was sent to the complainant informing that no inspection has been carried out and information report and checklist is not available. If this letter is considered, reply is in time.

5. During the course of hearing, the complainant states that he does not wish to proceed with the complaint and that he wants to withdraw the complaint. As per the records, it appears that information is furnished, so no intervention of this Commission is required. The request of the complainant 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 9th day of November, 2011.

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