

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION  
AT PANAJI**

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

**Complaint No.86/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 31/01/2011, 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 no information was furnished within the statutory period. Hence the complainant filed appeal before F.A.A. on 28/02/2011. By order dated 28/3/2011, the F.A.A. instructed the P.I.O. to provide the information within 10 days from the receipt of the said order. That even after period of 10 days, no information was furnished. Being aggrieved, the complainant 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 he furnished the information vide letter dated 03/03/2011. That in spite of this, the complainant preferred the appeal before F.A.A. That the same was preferred on 28/02/2011 and the same was premature. That the order of appellate authority came to

the knowledge of the opponent only on 13/6/2011. That opponent has within 10 days of knowledge, has once again furnished the information vide letter dated 22/6/2011. It is the case of the opponent that complaint is a result of confusion of the complainant. That the complainant had filed two applications. One dated 10/01/2011 and the other dated 31/01/2011 and the reply of these two applications have been interchanged during the proceeding with the F.A.A. and this has led to the passing of the order of the F.A.A. wherein directions have been issued to the opponent. That having furnished the information, the appellant has deliberately preferred the complaint. It is further the case of the opponent that there is no delay as such and that the complaint is liable to be dismissed.

4. Heard the complainant and perused the records. It is seen that by letter dated 31/1/2011, the complainant sought certain information. According to the opponent information is furnished by letter dated 3/3/2011. That again information was received after the order of the F.A.A. by letter dated 22/6/2011. According to the opponent there is absolutely no delay in furnishing the information.

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 same. It appears from the record that information has been furnished and since information is furnished, 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 9<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2011.

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

