

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
AT PANAJI**

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

Complaint No.172/SCIC/2011

Kum. Dr. Kalpana V. Kamat,
C/o.Vasant M. Kamat,
R/o.1st Floor, Caldeira Arcade,
Bhute Bhat, Mestawado, Vasco, Goa ... Complainant

V/s.

The Public Information Officer,
Town & Country Planning Department,
Mormugao, Vasco-Goa ... Opponent

Complainant present.
Opponent / P.I.O. present

ORDER
(07/06/2012)

1. The Complainant, Kum. Kalpana V. Kamat has filed the present complaint praying that the information as requested be furnished to her correctly; that penalty be imposed on P.I.O./First Appellate Authority as per law and that compensation be given as deemed fit.

2. It is the case of the complainant that the complainant, vide application dated 18/10/2011, 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 till date no response was received by the complainant. Since no information was furnished and being aggrieved the complainant has preferred the present complaint.

3. The case of the opponent is fully set out in the reply which is on record. In short, it is the case of the opponent that application dated 18/10/2011 received from the complainant was forwarded by this office under inward No.889 dated 19/10/2011 and the

same was marked to the dealing hand Smt. Asha Prabhu, official of the office. That the dealing hand, deemed A.P.I.O. scrutinized application and sent to the then P.I.O. on 17/11/2011 and that same P.I.O. signed the draft on the same date and that the information sought by the complainant was dispatched vide letter dated 17/11/2011 to the application. In short, it is the case of the opponent that as per the records available in the office the information sought by the complainant has already been dispatched and posted to the complainant vide letter dated 17/11/2011.

4. Heard the arguments of the complainant as well as opponent.

During the course of arguments, the complainant states that she has received the full information. According to the opponent inspection was also given and she has taken whatever documents required by her. The complainant states she has no grievance of any sort and that she has received the information. According to her, complaint 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 as information is furnished. The complaint is disposed off.

The complaint is accordingly disposed off.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 7th day of June, 2012.

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