

GOA INFORMATION COMMISSION

Ground Floor, "Shrama Shakti Bhavan", Patto Plaza, Panaji.

Complaint No. 20/SCIC/2008

Shri. Suryakant Tengali,
E, 131, Eugene Vado,
Caranzalem – Goa.

.....

Complainant.

V/s.

1. The Public Information Officer,
At Registrar of Co-operative Societies,
Altinho, Panaji – Goa.
2. The first Appellate Authority,
The Registrar of Co-operative Societies,
Altinho, Panaji – Goa.

.....

Opponents.

CORAM:

Shri A. Venkataratnam
State Chief Information Commissioner

(Per A. Venkataratnam)

Dated: 18/09/2008.

Complainant in person.

Opponent No. 1 present. Opponent No. 2 absent.

ORDER

In an earlier Appeal No. 16/2008 filed by the present Complainant, certain directions were issued to the Public Information Officer by the Commission's order dated 19/06/2008. Accordingly, the Opponent No. 1, Public Information Officer has complied with the Commission's order. The present complaint is that the compliance by the Opponent No. 1 is not in accordance with the order passed by this Commission on 19/06/2008. Therefore, it is necessary to discuss each point of request, the compliance and the present grievance of the Complainant. The first point is about the powers and duties of the officers of the Co-operative Department. Earlier, the Public Information Officer has brushed aside this query by referring the Complainant to the provisions of Co-operative Societies Act and Rules made thereunder. An effort is now made by his reply dated 26/06/2008, consequent on the issuance of the order by this Commission, to list out the duties of the Assistant Registrar of Co-operative Societies. The Complainant's grievance is that there are some more functions which are not listed by the Public Information Officer. While this may be so, this cannot be treated as non-compliance of the order of this Commission. If the Complainant is aware of more information than was provided by the Public Information Officer, it is up to him to utilize that information in the manner in which he deems fit. The Public Information Officer cannot be faulted for this.

...2/-

2. The Commission directed the information to be given on point No. 3 requested by the Complainant in his original request for information. This is about number of complaints/letters pertaining to NIO Co-op. Housing Society Ltd. at Soccoro village. The Public Information Officer has now submitted the list of letters received from Complainant himself regarding the above said Co-op. Housing Society. The Complainant made a grievance that he wanted all the letters regarding the above said Society alongwith the names and subject matters, directions issued etc. The request is not specific and therefore, the Public Information Officer's letter can be treated as sufficient compliance of the Commission's earlier order. The Complainant's next grievance is regarding the points 4 and 4(a) which relate to the details of the action taken by the Asst. Registrar (NZ) and the Registrar towards the discharge of the powers vested with them under the Co-op. Societies Act and Rules. The Public Information Officer has now informed the Complainant to approach the Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, North Zone, Mapusa for the requisite information. I do not know whether the Complainant has approached North Zone, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies. Further, it is also not clear what is exactly in the mind of the Complainant when he asked the Public Information Officer regarding the implementation of the obligation under the Co-operative Societies Act. He should be more specific in his query. On point No. 5 of his initial request, the Commission has rejected that it is "information" but an advice sought from Public Information Officer which is not permissible under the RTI Act. The Complainant is not satisfied with the Commission's order and made a grievance now. There is no reason further to consider this request. The point No. 8 is regarding the fees paid by the Registrar of Co-op. Societies office to the auditors. This has already been furnished now by the Public Information Officer yearwise. Point No. 9 is regarding obtaining the documents of audit reports. The Public Information Officer has volunteered to give the copies of the audit reports on payment of necessary fees. The Complainant instead of taking audit reports, wanted the interpretation of the audit reports vis a vis propriety of certain expenditure. This is not the forum to entertain this kind of request by the citizen.

3. With the above discussion, I find that the Public Information Officer has complied with the orders of this Commission and the present complaint is devoid of any merit. The complaint is accordingly dismissed.

Pronounced in the open court on this 18th day of September, 2008.

Sd/-
(A. Venkataratnam)
State Chief Information Commissioner