

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION  
AT PANAJI**

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

**Appeal No. 68/SIC/2011**

Shri Rony Dias,  
R/o.H. No.2, Murida, Cuncolim,  
Salcete, Goa

... Appellant.

V/s.

1. The First Appellate Authority,  
Directorate of Municipal Administration,  
Collectorate Building,  
Ground Floor, Panaji – Goa

2. The Public Information Officer,  
Cuncolim Municipal Council,  
Cuncolim, Salcete – Goa

... Respondents

Appellant in person.

Respondent No. 1 absent.

Respondent No.2 present

Smt. Kritika Dessai A.P.I.O. present at the time of order

**J U D G M E N T**  
**(22/12/2011)**

1. The Appellant, Shri Rony Dias, has filed the present appeal praying that an order be passed to release all the requested information free of cost U/s.7(6) within four working days; that the cost of information provided free, be recovered from the Public Information Officer; that penalty be imposed on the Public Information Officer; that necessary disciplinary action as per section 20(2) be initiated; that appellant be compensated for causing mental agony and action against Public Information Officer be taken.

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

That the appellant vide his application dated 25/10/2010 sought certain information under Right to Information Act, 2005 ('R.T.I. Act' for short) from the Public Information Officer (P.I.O.)/Respondent No. 2. That the respondent No.2 failed to provide information within the prescribed period. Being not satisfied, the appellant preferred appeal before First Appellate Authority/respondent No.1. That the F.A.A. by order dated 04/01/2011 allowed the appeal and the P.I.O. was ordered to give the information within 10 days time without charging any fees as per Section 7(6) of the R.T.I. Act. That inspite of the order the respondent No.2 did not furnish the information. Being aggrieved, the appellant has preferred the present appeal on various grounds as set out in the memo of appeal.

3. In pursuance of the notice, the P.I.O. appeared. He did not file any reply as such. However respondent No.2/P.I.O. advanced the arguments.

The respondent No.1 filed the reply which is on record. It is the case of respondent No.1 that he heard the appeal and order was passed.

4. Heard the appellant as well as respondent No.2 and perused the records. It is seen that vide application dated 25/10/2010 the appellant sought certain information. Since the same was not furnished the appellant preferred the appeal before the F.A.A. By order dated 04/01/2011, the F.A.A. ordered to furnish the information without charging the fees.

During the course of arguments, appellant states that he has received the information. He has no grievance of any sort and that the case can be closed.

5. Since information is furnished, no intervention of this Commission is required. Hence I pass the following order.

**ORDER**

No intervention of this Commission is required. The appeal is disposed off.

The appeal is accordingly disposed off.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of December, 2011.

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

