

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
AT PANAJI**

CORAM: Dr. Pradeep R. Padwal, State Information Commissioner

Complaint No.103/SIC/2012

Ms. Venicia Cardoso,
CT-2, Block C, Bldg. A,
Angod, Mapusa,
Bardez - Goa

... Complainant

V/s.

The Public Information Officer,
Department of Women & Child Development,
1st Floor, Shanta Building,
St. Inez, Panaji – Goa

... Opponent

Complainant present.
Opponent/PIO present.

ORDER
(04/09/2012)

1. The Complainant Ms. Venicia Cardoso, filed a complaint under No.103/SIC/2012 dated 25/6/2012 U/s.18(1) of R.T.I. Act, 2005 against the opponent/P.I.O./Department of Women and Child Development, Shanta Building, St. Inez, Panaji-Goa.
2. Ms. Venicia Cardoso had applied under Right to Information Act for certain information on 22/2/2012 regarding “Seva Trust” functioning in Goa alongwith other 14 questions.
3. The reply was furnished on 30/04/2012 by Public Information Officer (P.I.O.) regarding question No.1 to 12. Not satisfied with the information, complainant lodged present complaint under review with Goa State Information Commission. The complaint was entertained and P.I.O./Department of Child Development was granted an opportunity to furnish the written reply which was received on 25/7/2012. Copy of the same was

furnished to the complainant. Additional written reply was furnished by P.I.O. on 14/8/2012 alongwith two enclosures including report on inspection of Seva Trust. Copy of additional written reply was also furnished to the complainant. On 14/8/2012 in the said reply, it is clarified that there is no report of inquiry conducted, though the report to question No.14 is with reference to the letter received from Children's Rights in Goa dated 25/4/2012.

4. The complainant expressed satisfaction with both the written replies while simultaneously objecting to non inclusion of this information in the original reply. P.I.O. pleaded with defense that only the information as made available to her has been furnished. However, this exercise of entertaining a complaint and subsequent disclosure could have been avoided if the P.I.O. were to be more careful in furnishing complete information. P.I.O. is therefore advised to be more diligent in dealing with matters pertaining to R.T.I.

5. Complainant withdrew the request for penalty being satisfied with the written explanation from the opponent alleying the doubts regarding any malafide intention. The issue is amicably settled.

No further intervention from State Information Commission.

The complaint is accordingly disposed off.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 4th day of September, 2012.

Sd/-
(Dr. PRADEEP R. PADWAL)
State Information Commissioner