

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**AT PANAJI**

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

**Complaint No. 535/SCIC/2010**

Mr. Sadanand D. Vaingankar,  
304, Madhlawada, Harmal,  
Pernem – Goa

... Complainant.

V/s

Public Information Officer,  
Office of Secretary,  
Village Panchayat Arambol,  
Pernem – Goa

... Opponent.

Complainant absent.  
Opponent absent.

**O R D E R**  
(02.12.2011)

1. By Order dated 27.07.2011 the Complainant was given an opportunity to prove that the information furnished is false, incorrect and misleading.

2. It is seen that the Complainant vide application dated 20.05.2010 sought certain information under the Right to Information Act, 2005. By reply dated 17.06.2010 the Opponent furnished the information. The information consisted of 8 points and all 8 points were duly replied. The only grievance of the Complainant was that the information furnished is improper and false. Hence, the Complainant was given an opportunity to prove that the same is false and inquiry was posted on 08.09.2011. On 08.09.2011 the Complainant remained absent. Opponent also was absent. Again on 23.09.2011 Complainant and Opponent were absent. On 24.10.2011 Complainant was present and Opponent was absent. Notice was issued to the Opponent to remain present. He did not remain present on the following date i.e. on 28.11.2011. Complainant also was absent on this day. Ultimately matter was posted on 02.12.2011. On 02.12.2011 again Complainant is absent. Opponent is also absent. Various opportunities were given to the parties to remain present. However, they did not care to remain present. Of course the burden was

on the Complainant to prove that information was false. However, he did not discharge the said burden.

3. I have carefully gone through the records of the case. It is seen that information was sought in respect of scrap yard situated at Arambol-Palye main road, Opp. Arun Mandrekar's residence, 100mts. away from petrol pump. The information was sought in respect of 8 points. All the 8 points are duly replied. From the queries asked and the replies furnished it appears the same have been properly answered. Since Complainant alleged that it is false it was the Complainant's duty to counter Opponent's claim. However, he neither submitted any record to show that information furnished is false nor he remained present. In my view he did not discharge the burden cast on him. In any case there is no need in waiting for long. It appears Complainant also is not interested in proceeding with the matter and as such the proceedings are dropped..

4. In view of all this, I pass the following Order:-

**ORDER**

Inquiry proceedings are dropped.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of December, 2011.

Sd/-  
(M. S. Keny)  
State Information Commission