

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION  
AT PANAJI**

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

**Complaint No. 58/SCIC/2012**

Mrs. Maria P. Fernandes e Rodrigues,  
R/o. Flat No.6, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor,  
Sunrise Apartment,  
Mazilvaddo, Benaulim – Goa

**... Complainant.**

V/s.

1) Shri P. M. Naik,  
Public Information Officer,  
The Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies,  
South Zone, Margao  
Salcete – Goa

2) The Office Superintendent of  
The Office of the Asst. Registrar of  
Co-operative Societies, South Zone,  
Margao, Salcete - Goa

**...Opponent.**

Adv. Shri A. Dessai for Complainant.

Opponent No. 1 in person.

Opponent No. 2 in person.

**O R D E R**

**(24.07.2012)**

1. The Complainant, Smt. Maria P. Fernandes e Rodrigues has filed the present Complaint praying to direct the Opponent No. 1 to provide the specific information to question No. 2 and question No. 5 of Complainant's RTI application dated 16.08.2011; to direct the Opponent No. 1 and 2 to file information related to question No. 2 and question No. 5 of Complainant's application dated 16.08.2011 whether the said record was filed or was not filed in the office of Opponent No. 1 and 2; to punish the Opponents under Section 20 of RTI Act; to direct investigation and prosecution by the police department in respect of the said theft or loss or missing or damage or disappearance or destruction of the said public record; for taking disciplinary action under the service rules.

2. The brief facts leading to the present Complaint are as under:-

That the Complainant vide application dated 16.08.2011 sought certain information under Right to Information Act, 2005 ('R.T.I. Act' for short) from the Public Information Officer ('P.I.O.)/Opponent No. 1. That

the Complainant received the incomplete, incorrect and misleading information from the Opponent No.1 vide his letter dated 30.08.2011. Being aggrieved the Complainant has filed the present Complaint.

3. Written submissions on behalf of PIO/Opponent No.1 is on record. That the Opponent denies the allegations of the Complainant under point No. 3 and 4. That the P.I.O. is duty bound to furnish the information requested by the Complainant only if that information is available on record. That the replies to question 2 and 5 were prepared and furnished to the Complainant strictly as per the availability of relevant information. It is also the case of Opponent No. 1 that the P.I.O. has not made any violation of RTI Act and hence not liable for any inquiry.

4. During the course of hearing the Advocate for the Appellant Shri A. Dessai has filed an application stating that the Complainant wants to withdraw the Complaint.

5. It is seen from record that information is furnished. In any case since the Complainant wants to withdraw the Complaint the request is to be granted.

6. In view of the above I pass the following Order:-

### **ORDER**

No intervention of this Commission is required. The Complaint is disposed off as withdrawn.

The Complaint is accordingly disposed off.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 24<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2012.

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