# GOA INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

**Appeal / 117 / SIC / 2008 /**

Shri Subodh S. Sawant,
B-2, Shanti Campus, Nr. Mehul Talkies,
Nr Mahesh Tutorials, Mulund,
West, Mumbai – 400 080 ..... Appellant

V/s

1. The Public Information Officer,
   Shri Pramod D. Bhat,
   In the Office of the Mamlatdar of Bicholim Taluka,
   Bicholim – Goa. ..... .... Respondent No.1..

2. The First Appellate Authority,
   Shri Arvind V. Budge,
   The Deputy Collector & S.D.O.,
   Bicholim – Goa. ..... .... Respondent No.2..

**CORAM:**

Shri G. G. Kambli
State Information Commissioner

(Per G. G. Kambli)

Dated: 23/09/2008.

Appellant in person.

Respondent No. 1 present in person.

Respondent No. 2 absent.

## O R D E R

The Appellant approached the Respondent No. 1 vide his application dated 07/05/2008 bearing reference No. 5/7 under the Right to Information Act 2005 (for short the Act) requesting the Respondent No.1 to provide him whether any kind of leave such as sick leave/Casual leave/paid leave/earned leave/paternity leave/ any other kind of leave has been sanctioned to Shri Sadanand Gaad, Devasthan Clerk working in the office of the Respondent No. 1 for the period from 01/01/2001 to 31/12/2001.

2. The Appellant did not receive any reply from the Respondent No.1 within the time limit specified in sub-section (1) of section 7 of the Act. The Appellant, therefore, filed the first Appeal before the Respondent No. 2, on 2nd July, 2008. The Respondent No. 2 also did not bother to dispose off the first Appeal within the time limit laid down in sub-section (6) of section 19 of the Act. The Appellant therefore approached this Commission by way of

…2/-

2nd Appeal against both the Respondents on various grounds as set out in the memo of appeal.

3. The notices were issued to all the parties. The Appellant and the Respondent No. 1 remained present in person. The Respondent No. 2 neither remained present nor filed any reply. The Appellant, submitted that he has been making the applications seeking information to the Respondent No. 1 and also filing the Appeals before the Respondent No. 2, under the Act but neither the Respondent No. 1 nor the Respondent No. 2 are taking any action on his applications or appeals. He is, therefore, compelled to file the second Appeals before this Commission. He therefore, prayed that he should be adequately compensated as he is coming all the way from Mumbai to persue his applications and appeals and therefore he has been put to much hardships. He also prayed that penalties be imposed on both the Respondents for not adhering to the provisions of the Ac.

4. The Respondent No. 1 submitted that the information is being kept ready and the same will be provided to the Appellant. The Respondent No. 1 did not claim any exemption on any of the provisions of the Act. Therefore, the Respondent No. 1 is hereby directed to provide the information to the Appellant as per this application dated 07/05/2008 bearing reference No. 5/7 within a period of 30 days from today.

5. Pronounced in the open Court on this 23rd day of September, 2008 in the presence of the Appellant as well as the Respondent No. 1.

Sd/-
(G. G. Kambli)
State Information Commissioner