GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
AT PANAJI

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

Appeal No. 69/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 21/10/2010 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. Hence the appellant preferred appeal before First Appellate Authority(F.A.A.)/respondent No.1. By order dated 04/01/2011 the F.A.A. allowed the appeal and the P.I.O. was ordered to furnish the information within 10 days time without charging fees. That inspite of the order the respondent No.2 information was not furnished. 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 respondent appeared. Respondent No.2 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 appeal was filed, he heard the appeal and disposed the same by order dated 4/1/2011.

4. Heard the appellant as well as respondent No.2 and perused the records.

During the course of arguments, appellant states that he has received the information, he is satisfied with the same and that he does not have any grievance of any sort. According to him appeal can be disposed of.

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

O R D E R

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

The appeal is accordingly disposed off.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 22nd day of December, 2011.

Sd/-

(M. S. Keny)
State Chief Information Commissioner