

# GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

## AT PANAJI

**CORAM:** Shri Afonso Araujo, State Information Commissioner

**Appeal No. 53/SIC/2009**

Smt. Sushma V. Karapurkar,  
H. No. 46, Karaswada, Mapusa,  
Post. Tivim Indl. Estate,  
Bardez – Goa- 403 52 6

... Appellant.

V/s.

1) Public Information Officer,  
Office of Joint Director of Accounts,  
Directorate of Accounts,  
Panaji – Goa – 403 001

... Respondent No. 1

2) The First Appellate Authority,  
Office of Director of Accounts,  
Directorate of Accounts,  
Panaji – Goa – 403 001

...Respondent No. 2

Appellant absent.

Smt. H. Naik for the Respondents.

### **JUDGMENT**

(Per Afonso Araujo)

By request dated 11.06.2009 the Appellant sought information under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (for short, 'The Act') and which consists of information at Sr. No. 1 to 20 pertaining to the family pension case of late Vasudev R. Karapurkar. This information was sought on the footing that it concerns life and liberty of a person and required the same within 48 hours from the receipt of the request.

2. Not satisfied with the information provided by the Respondent No. 1 in the communication dated 06.07.2009, the Appellant preferred the First Appeal and by order dated 30.06.2009 the First Appellate Authority-Respondent No. 2 rejected the appeal. The Appellant preferred the Second Appeal with a prayer to direct the

...2/-

Public Information Officer to furnish the Appellant information free of cost; compensate the Appellant; impose penalties; recommend disciplinary action.

3. The Respondent No. 1 by communication dated 06.07.2009 provided the information sought by the Appellant in the request dated 11.06.2009. Each and every information at Sr. No. 1 to 20 has been provided by the Respondent No. 1 and within the prescribed period of thirty days. Though the Appellant required the information within 48 hours, from the tone and tenor of the information sought there is nothing to indicate that there was any urgency affecting life and liberty and the information had to be provided within 48 hours. The Appellant also has not specified in what manner she is not satisfied with the information provided and the only grievance of the Appellant is that the information was not provided within 48 hours.

4. Since the information provided by the Respondent No. 1 meets the requirements of the information sought by the Appellant and since there were no grounds for providing information within 48 hours, there is no merit in this appeal. Hence, the following order:

**ORDER**

The appeal is dismissed.

Pronounced on this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of December, 2009.

Sd/-  
**(Afonso Araujo)**  
**State Information Commissioner**

