

## **GOA INFORMATION COMMISSION**

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

Complaint No. 29/SCIC/2008

Shri. R. G. Joshi,  
5, Suvihar Co-op. Hsg. Society Ltd.,  
Near Power House, Pontemol,  
Curchorem – Goa.

..... Complainant.

V/s.

Public Information Officer,  
The Chief Officer,  
Curchorem Cacora Municipal Council,  
Curchorem – Goa

..... Opponent.

### **CORAM:**

Shri A. Venkataratnam  
State Chief Information Commissioner

(Per A. Venkataratnam)

Dated: 30/12/2008.

Complainant in person.

Adv. L. Raghunandan for Opponent.

## **ORDER**

By an application dated 26/05/2008, the Complainant has approached the Opponent, i.e. the Public Information Officer of the Curchorem Municipal Council for certain information on 9 points. A reply was received by him on 25/06/2008 from the Opponent. Not satisfied with the reply, a first appeal was filed on 2/7/2008 before the Director of Municipal Administration and First Appellate Authority who passed an order on 29/7/2008 allowing the appeal partly to provide information on points No. 1, 2, 3 and 5 of the original request. 4 points were disallowed namely, questions No. 4, 6, 8 and 9. Question No. 7 relates to the inspection of the office records. It is not known whether the Complainant approached the Opponent for inspection of the records.

2. The Complainant now has come with this Complaint stating that the replies are not satisfactory. Notices were issued and the parties have appeared as mentioned above. After the First Appellate Authority has passed his order, the Respondent No. 1 has sent another letter on 21/08/2008 giving further information as directed by the Respondent No. 2. I will take only these issues. On the first point, as directed by the

...2/-

First Appellate Authority, copies of the noting sheets have been given by the Public Information Officer. The second point regarding documents also is complied with by the Public Information Officer. The third point relates to the copies of the site inspection report. The Public Information Officer stated that the site inspection did not take place and as and when it is carried out, the information will be given. The fifth point is about the illegal construction of compound wall by Shri. Raghunath Ghadi at Pontemol, Curchorem. At the time of furnishing the reply, the matter of giving or refusing the permission to the compound wall was not decided yet by the Municipal Council and the file has been submitted to the Town and Country Planning Department on 11/07/2007. In any case, the Municipal Council has clearly mentioned that they have not demolished the compound wall.

3. With above replies, all the questions posed by the Complainant are answered satisfactorily and no further remedy will lie. Further action, if any, will lie at the appropriate forum based on the information collected from the Municipal Council. On the last point No. 7 regarding the inspection of the documents, there is no grievance from the Complainant that the inspection was denied. He has to approach the Municipal Council for inspection of the records, if required. In any case revised plans have already been provided. There are no points further for giving information by the Public Information Officer. The complaint, therefore, is devoid of any merit and is hereby dismissed.

Pronounced in the open court on this 30<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2008.

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



