

GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
AT PANAJI

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

Appeal 214/SCIC/2011

Vincent Dias,
H.No.503, Murida Fatorda,
Margao-Goa.,

... ..Complainant

V/s

1) Public Information Officer,
SGPDA,
Osia Complex,
Margao-Goa.

2) The First Appellate authority,
SGPDA,
Near SGPDA Market Complex,
Margao-Goa.

..... Respondents

Appellant in person
Respondent No. 1 and 2 absent.
Adv. V. Sirsat for Opponent no.1

JUDGEMENT
(20-04-2012)

1. The Appellant, Shri Vincent Dias, has filed the present appeal praying for compensation as well as penalty for non-supply within the prescribed time limit.
2. It is the case of the Appellant that since his R.T.I. Application dated 14/07/2011 was not replied to by the P.I.O., therefore he filed a first information Appeal dated 19/09/2011 before 1st Appellate Authority. That the Appellant met the P.I.O. on a couple of occasions for a reply but the P.I.O. did not give reply. That on 27/09/2011 after the 1st Appellate Authority without hearing the Appellant simply dismissed his appeal under a technical flimsy ground which clearly shows bias by the said Authority. That the Appellant tried his best to avoid the 1st information appeal as he still felt the P.I.O. may give a reply and so also felt the delay could be due to posts if the reply was so given by the P.I.O. Since reply was not furnished he preferred an appeal. That the Appellant later received the reply but beyond time. According to the Appellant Compensation be granted and hence the present Appeal.
3. In pursuance of the notice received Adv. Shri V. Shirsat appeared on behalf of the Respondent No..1/P.I.O. However, later on P.I.O. did not appear though notice was issued to him. In any case, I am proceeding on the basis of record.

4. Heard the Appellant. The Appellant has also filed the written arguments which are on record.
5. I have carefully gone through the records of the case and also considered the arguments advanced by the party. It is not in dispute that information was sought. It is also not in dispute that information was furnished, but some what late. In the complaint filed by the appellant herein this aspect is dealt. Even notice has been issued.
6. In any case since information is furnished no intervention of this Commission is required. However the Respondent no.1 is to be heard on the aspect of delay/compensation etc.

In view of all the above I pass the following order:

ORDER

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

Issue notice to the P.I.O./Respondent No.1 to show cause why compensation/penalty should not be imposed on the P.I.O./Respondent no.1. The reply if any should reach the commission on or before 12/06/2012 P.I.O./Respondent No.1 shall appear for hearing .

Further inquiry posted on 12/06/2012 at 10.30 a.m.

Appeal is accordingly disposed off.

Pronounced in the commission on this 20th day of April 2012.

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