

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION  
AT PANAJI**

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

**Complaint No.30/SIC/2011**

Mr. Ajay E. Vellingiri,  
H. No. 61/GL/38,  
Behind Old MPT Hospital,  
Vasco-da-Gama,  
Goa

... Complainant.

V/s.

Public Information Officer,  
Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority,  
Office of Department of Science, Technology  
& Environment,  
Opp. Saligao Seminary,  
Saligao – Goa

.....Opponent.

Complainant absent.  
Opponent in person.

**ORDER**  
**(05-12-2011)**

1. The Complainant, Shri Ajay Vellingiri, has filed the present Complaint praying that correct and complete information be furnished to the Appellant as fast as possible; that the information should be provided free of cost; that disciplinary action under Section 20 against the Public Information Officer be initiated and that compensation be given to the Appellant.

2. The gist of the Complainant's case is as under:

That the Complainant vide application dated 23.11.2010 sought certain information under Right to Information Act, 2005 ('R.T.I. Act' for short) from the P.I.O./Opponent. That the P.I.O. failed to reply within the stipulated period of 30 days. That the P.I.O. refused the information as per Section 7(2). Hence the present Complaint.

3. The Opponent resists the Complaint and the reply/submissions of the Opponent is on record. It is the case of the Opponent that the Complainant filed an application under RTI Act on 23.11.2010. That the stipulated period ends on 23.12.2010. That the information was posted to the Complainant on the address mentioned in the application on 11.12.2010. That the Complainant has failed to exhaust the services of First Appellate Authority but instead chose to approach the Commission and file the Complaint. In short, it is the case of the Opponent that information was posted to the Complainant on the given address, i.e. the address mentioned in the application. That there is no delay on the part of the Opponent so the question of disciplinary action, etc. does not arise. According to the Opponent the Complaint be dismissed.

4. It is seen from the record that Complainant appeared only once on 27.04.2011. Thereafter the Complainant did not appear before the Commission. On 18.11.2011 fresh notice was issued to the Complainant. However, the Complainant remained absent. It appears that the Complainant is not interested in proceeding with the matter. In any case I am proceeding on the basis of the record.

5. Heard the Opponent and perused the records. It is seen that by application dated 23.11.2010 the Complainant sought certain information i.e. certified copies of all the documents of action taken with regard to the letter dated 24.09.2010, notings, etc. It is seen from the record that by letter dated 11.12.2010 it was informed to the Complainant that his request has been considered and the information is provided. It appears

that the said letter was posted to the Complainant. Address given in the letter and in the Complaint tallies. The Complainant has not disputed this nor controverted the contents of the letter dated 11.12.2010. The Opponent states that the letter was posted to the Complainant. There is no reason to disbelieve the Opponent especially in view of the fact that Complainant did not challenge the same.

6. Regarding delay it is seen that the application is dated 23.11.2010. As per records the reply is dated 11.12.2010. The reply is in time. Since reply is in time the question of delay does not arise.

In any case 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 since information is furnished. The Complaint is disposed off.

The Complaint is accordingly disposed off.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 05<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2011.

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



