

GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISISON
Ground Floor, Shrama Shakti Bhavan, Patto Plaza, Panaji-Goa
Coram : Smt. Leena Mehendale, State Chief Information Commissioner

Appeal No.38/SIC/2013

Decided on :15/09/2014

Capt. Menino Francisco Gregory Fernandes,
C/o. Ashleen F. Fernandes
101- B, Florence, Mithagar Road,
Kanderpada, Dahisar (W),
Mumbai- 400 068.

----- Appellant

V/s

1. The State Public Information Officer,
The Asst. Executive Engineer,
Electricity Department,
Government of Goa
2. The First Appellate Authority
Government of Goa
O/o. Superintending Engineer,
Circle- I (S) Electricity Department,
3rd Floor, Aquem
Margao- Goa.

----- Respondents

ORDER

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| RTI Application: - | 18.01.2013 |
| PIO replied on: - | 04.02.2013 |
| First Appeal filed on: - | 11.02.2013 |
| FAA Order dated: - | 28/02/2013 |
| Second Appeal filed on: - | 11/03/2013 |

- 1) This second appeal has a short point. The information has been given with a delay of few days. The RTI application was made on 18/01/2013, the PIO collected information from APIO and intimated the appellant; on 04.02.2013 to collect the information in 1 page by paying Rs. 2/-. When charges were paid , the PIO supplied copy received from APIO stating that the file was not traceable.
- 2) Hence the first appeal was filed on 11/02/2013. The FAA has passed order on 28/02/2013 asking APIO to furnish whatever part information was available. APIO gave him 12 documents free of cost which he collected on same day. As for delay, he was advised by the FAA to approached SCIC.
- 3) Thus this second appeal has been filed on 12/04/2013, requesting for a penalty of Rs. 25000/- for the delay against the the APIO Shri T.S. Vincent.

- a) It is clear from the above that nothing remain in this appeal as all the information has been provided. The appellant has prayed for penalty against APIO Shri T.S. Vincent. Which has to be taken up separately under section 20 (1) for,
- a) Not giving full information.
b) Not giving available information in time.
- 4) I have to also instruct present PIO in particular and all PIOs in general that the RTI applicant must never be called upon to pay “Additional fees” of Rs. 2/- to supply a one- page information, whatever be its contents. The cost of collecting any “Additional fees” below Rs. 20/- (PIO informing applicant, then applicant approaching PIO office to pay, then PIO sending reply by post etc) is a waste of time and money for everybody concerned with the matter.
- 5) As for the present second appeal, it is closed. A separate penalty file may be opened by registry and notice may be issued by name to Shri T.S. Vincent then APIO by name under section 20(1). The then PIO should also be impleaded by name as Respondent No. 2.

--- O R D E R---

Second Appeal closed. A separate penalty case to be started as above.

Sd/-

(Leena Mehendale)

State Chief Information Commissioner
Goa State Information Commission
Panaji – Goa.