

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION  
AT PANAJI**

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

**Complaint No.80/SIC/2011**

Shri Uday A. C. Priolkar,  
R/o. H. No.C5/55, Mala,  
Panaji – Goa

... Complainant

**V/s**

State Public Information Officer,  
Director of Mines,  
Vidhyut Bhavan,  
Panaji, Goa

... Opponents

Complainant present  
Opponent present.

**ORDER**  
(13/04/2012)

1. The Complainant, Shri Uday A. C. Priolkar, has filed the present complaint praying that the opponent be directed to furnish the information as sought by him; that costs of Rs.250/- per day be paid to the complainant; that disciplinary proceedings be initiated against the opponent and that compensation be granted to the Complainant for causing mental and physical torture for failure to furnish the information

2. The case of the complainant has been fully set out in the complaint. In short it is the case of the complainant that, vide letter dated 22/2/2011, the complainant sought certain information under Right to Information Act, 2005 ('R.T.I. Act for short) from the opponent/Public Information Officer (P.I.O.). That the Public Information Officer failed to provide the required information within the stipulated time nor responded to his application. Hence the present complaint on various grounds as mentioned in the complaint,

3. It is the case of the opponent/P.I.O. that the information sought by the complainant was furnished to him vide letter dated 22/7/2011. That some information was not available with the department of the opponent and hence was transferred to Forest Department. By letter dated 7/9/2011 the said information was also furnished. That the delay was as the information was to be collected from various dealing hands.

4. Heard the arguments and perused the records of the case.

It is seen that the complainant sought certain information from the opponent. The application was received in the office of opponent on 22/2/2011. However information was not furnished.

During the course of arguments, the complainant states that he has received the information.

The only grievance of the complainant is that there is delay in furnishing the information.

5. Now it is to be seen whether there is delay. It is seen that application is dated 22/02/2011. The reply is furnished on 22/7/2011. Apparently there is some delay. However, P.I.O. must be given an opportunity to explain about the same in the factual backdrop of this case.

6. In view of the above, since information is furnished, no intervention of this Commission is required. The P.I.O./opponent is to be heard on the aspect of delay. Hence I pass the following order.

### **ORDER**

Complaint is allowed. No intervention of this Commission is required as information is furnished.

Issue notice U/s.20(1) of Right to Information Act, 2005 to the Public Information Officer/opponent. to show cause why penalty action should not be taken against him for causing delay in furnishing information. The explanation if any should reach the Commission on or before **05/06/2012**. The P.I.O./Opponent shall appear for hearing.

Further inquiry posted on **05/06/2012** at **10.30 a.m..**

The Complaint is accordingly disposed off.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 13<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2012.

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