GOA INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

Appeal No. 210/SCIC/2008

Shri. Kashinath Shetye,
Bambino Building, Alto Fondvem,
Ribandar, Tiswadi – Goa. …… Appellant.

V/s.

1. The Chief Officer &
   Public Information Officer,
   Valpoi Municipal Council,
   Valpoi – Goa.
2. First Appellate Authority,
   The Director,
   Directorate of Municipal Administration,
   Panaji - Goa. …… Respondents.

CORAM:

Shri A. Venkataratnam
State Chief Information Commissioner

(Per A. Venkataratnam)

Dated: 13/02/2009.

Appellant in person.

Authorized representative Smt. Drina P. Dias on behalf of Respondent No. 1 present. Respondent No. 2 absent.

O R D E R

This disposes off the second appeal filed by the Appellant for non-execution of the order of the First Appellate Authority, Respondent No. 2 herein. The brief facts are that the Appellant by his request dated 22/9/2008 asked for certain information pertaining to all the Municipal Councils in Goa but addressed to the Dy. Director of Municipal Administration who is neither the Public Information Officer of the Directorate of Municipal Administration nor is concerned with other Municipal Councils which are separate public authorities. Infact, there is no Dy. Director of Municipal Administration. The facts are already incorporated in my common order dated 06/02/2009 in respect of all other Municipal Councils. The fact of the matter is that the Appellant has not approached the proper authority and is insisting now to levy the fine on the Public Information Officer of Valpoi Municipal Council for giving incomplete information and for the delay. As to the incompleteness of the

…2/-

information, he has not cited any particular instance. As to the delay, he should be glad that the information is already provided by the Public Information Officer though not directly addressed to him. The questionnaire was received via Directorate of Municipal Administration but was replied by the Public Information Officer. Similarly, he has also complied with the direction of the Respondent No. 2 to furnish the information, though delayed. The information requested is of course voluminous and I am satisfied that diligent steps were taken by the Public Information Officer to furnish the information. As such, the second appeal stands dismissed, as lacking merits.

Pronounced in the open court on this 13th day of February, 2009.

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