GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION AT PANAJI

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

Complaint No. 92/SIC/2012

Ganesh G. Chodankar, H. No. 945, Raulobancho, St. Agostinho, Santa Cruz – Goa

Complainant

V/s.

Public Information Officer, Office of Labour Commissioner, Government of Goa, Patto, Panaji – Goa

Opponent.

Complainant in person. Opponent in person.

ORDER (19.07.2012)

- 1. The Complainant, Shri Ganesh G. Chodankar, has filed the present Complaint praying that information be provided and that penalty be imposed.
- 2. The brief facts leading to the present Complaint are as under:-

That the Complainant, vide application dated 24.02.2012 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 the Opponent/PIO provided incomplete information on payment of Rs.2/-. That the information provided was vague and not proper just to hide the malafide acts of Labour Commissioner. That the copy of the scheme ought to have been provided. That the copy of the Order of allotment of work/duty to each Labour Inspector to the said scheme is not provided and that information is created and provided. Being aggrieved the Complainant has filed the 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 after receiving the application of the Complainant the PIO collected the information from the concerned officials and intimated the Complainant to attend office at the earliest to collect the information sought by him by paying the requisite fees of Rs.2/- vide letter dated 22.03.2012. That the Complainant attended the office on 27.03.2012 and collected the information sought by him by paying the requisite fee of Rs.2/- vide letter dated 27.03.2012. That the Opponent was surprised to see that the Complainant had filed Complaint before the Commission on the same application which has already been disposed by the Opponent within the stipulated time frame. It is further the case of the Opponent that there is no creation of any information in respect of the application filed by the Complainant under RTI Act. That the information which is available in the office is a part of records the same has been furnished to the Complainant. That the Opponent did not furnish any false information. That the PIO has furnished the point-wise information as per the application dated 24.02.2012. That since information is furnished the present Complaint does not lie.
- 4. Heard the Complaint as well as the Opponent and perused the records of the case. It is seen that the Complainant sought information vide letter dated 24.02.2012. It is seen that by letter dated 22.03.2012 the Complainant was called to collect the information by paying requisite fee of Rs.2/-. It is seen from record that the Complainant had paid the amount and received the information.
- 5. The Complainant contended that the information furnished was false. However, the PIO pointed out that the information was provided as existing with the Public Authority and whatever was asked was furnished. The Complainant on his part agrees. Of course certain documents are not furnished. However, if the Complainant wants he can seek the same by filing fresh application. Perusal of records shows that information is furnished.

6. 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 19th day of July, 2012.

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