

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
AT PANAJI**

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

Complaint No.106/SCIC/2011

Shri Judas J. F. X. Fernandes,
R/o.H. No.168, Kevona,
Rivona, Sanguem-Goa ... Complainant

V/s.

P.I.O., Kadamba Transport Corp. Ltd.
Alto Porvorim,
Bardez – Goa ... Opponent

Complainant present.
Opponent present.
Adv. P. Agrawal for opponent present.

ORDER
(16/02/2012)

1. The Complainant, Judas J. F. X. Fernandes has filed the present complaint praying that P.I.O./ Opponent be directed to give full information sought by the complainant vide application dated 16/2/2011. That the opponent be fined for not furnishing information and that the complaint be allowed.

2. The brief facts leading to the present complaint are as under:-
That the complainant, vide application dated 16/02/2011 sought certain information under Right to Information Act, 2005 ('R.T.I.' Act for short) from the Public Information Officer('P.I.O.)/opponent. That vide reply dated 9/3/2011 the opponent issued part information with regards to certain questions. However with regards to other questions the opponent did not furnish the information. Since information was not furnished the complainant filed appeal before First Appellate Authority (FAA). That the F.A.A by order dated 6/4/2011 directed the opponent to issue entire

information to the Complainant within a period of 30 days. That by letter dated 18/5/2011, the opponent furnished part of the information. However, the opponent is yet to furnish full information as directed by F.A.A. vide order dated 6/4/2011. Being aggrieved the complainant has filed present complaint.

3. The opponent resists the complaint and the reply of the opponent is on record. In short it is the case of the opponent that complainant sought certain information vide application dated 16/2/2011 with the opponent. Vide letter dated 09/03/2011 the opponent informed the complainant that there are large number of inquiry files which are in custody of Personal Department and the applicant was requested to inspect the files and upon inspection, the information desired by him will be made available to him. However the complainant did not take any inspection. That the information sought by the complainant does not fall under definition of information U/s.2(f)(i) and (j). Hence no such information could be furnished. That information in respect of Sr. No.2 was furnished. It is further the case of the opponent that the Corporation has 1900 employees and has conducted large number of inquiries since its inspection in 1981 and it is voluminous to find out as to how many inquiries C.S.W. was examined first as defense witness unless specifically pointed out, the required information could not be furnished. According to the opponent they are prepared to give inspection of the files if the complainant desires to take inspection.

4. Heard the arguments. The complainant argued in person and the ld. Adv. Shri P. Agrawal argued on behalf of the opponent. The written submission of the complainant is on record.

5. I have carefully gone through the records of the case and also considered arguments advanced by the parties.

It is seen that, vide application dated 16/2/2011, the complainant sought certain information. The information

consisted of two items i.e. Sr. No.1 and 2. Vide letter dated 09/03/2011, the P.I.O. furnished the information. In respect of point No.1, P.I.O. sought certain details of the files so that information could be provided. It was also informed to the complainant that the records of the inquiries sought by him are not maintained by Personal Department. It was also informed that there are number of inquiries files in custody of Personal Department which are conducted by different inquiry officers and hence the details were sought. Regarding point No.2, the information was furnished. It appears that being not satisfied the complainant preferred appeal before First Appellate Authority (F.A.A.) and by order dated 6/4/2011, the F.A.A. directed P.I.O. to supply copies of all the proceedings conducted for the last 5 years by Shirvoikar by accepting the cost within 30 days from the receipt of the order.

6. During the course of arguments, the complainants state that the information has been furnished and that he has no grievance of any sort.

7. Since information is furnished no intervention of this Commission is required and hence I pass the following order:-

ORDER

No intervention of this Commission is required since information is furnished. The complaint is disposed off.

The complaint is accordingly disposed off.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 16th day of February, 2012.

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