

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION  
AT PANAJI**

**CORAM:** Shri M. S. Keny, State Chief Information Commissioner

Complaint No. 12/SCIC/2010

Mrs. Sheetal S. Pednekar,  
House No. 33, Sauntowaddo,  
Assagao, Bardez – Goa.

..... Complainant.

V/s.

Public Information Officer,  
The Deputy Director of Panchayats (North),  
Directorate of Panchayats,  
3<sup>rd</sup> floor, 3<sup>rd</sup> lift, Junta House,  
Panaji - Goa.

..... Opponent/Respondent.

Shri C. S. Barreto, authorized representative on behalf of Complainant.  
Opponent in person.

**ORDER**  
**(06-04-2010)**

1. The Complainant, Smt. Sheetal S. Pednekar, has filed this Complaint praying that Opponent be directed to furnish a copy of the action taken report in respect of demolition of the illegal structure and also to furnish copy of the action taken report in respect of Secretary and Sarpanch and for penalty.

2. The brief facts leading to the present Complaint are as under: -

That the Complainant by letter dated 18/12/2009 sought certain information under Right to Information Act ('RTI' Act for short). That the said letter was duly received at the office of the Opponent but no action was taken. It is the case of the Complainant that Opponent is deliberately trying to suppress taking action against the said Sarpanch and Secretary for reasons best known to him. Hence, the present Complaint.

...2/-

3. Opponent resist the application and the reply is on record. It is the case of the Opponent that the required information has been furnished to the Complainant by letter No. 26/87/DP/RIA/2008/432 dated 15/1/2010. According to the Opponent, Complaint is liable to be dismissed.

4. Heard the arguments. Shri Caetano Barreto argued on behalf of the Complainant and the Opponent argued in person. According to the Opponent matters are pending and that show cause notice is already issued.

5. I have carefully gone through the records of the case and also considered the arguments of the parties. The point that arises for consideration is whether the information is furnished or not?

It is seen that application asking for information was filed on 18/12/2009. It is seen that the same was received on the same day as per the endorsement. The information sought is regarding action taken. It is seen that by letter dated 15/1/2010 the Opponent sent the reply thereby furnishing the information. Copy of the show cause notice has been furnished. In fact perusal of reply and show cause notice show that the information sought has been furnished. There is no delay in supplying the same as can be seen from the records.

6. It is the contention of the Complainant that no information has been furnished. However, it is seen that the same has been provided partly by giving reply and partly by way of producing copy of the show cause notice. I have gone through the said copy. Furnishing of the same could have been done in a better way considering the fact that RTI Act is a people friendly, user friendly Act. No doubt it is not an offence but authorities should bear in mind the spirit behind the Act.

7. In view of all the above, I am of the opinion that there is no delay as such so as to invite penal provisions of the Act. No intervention of this Commission is required, however, the information as mentioned above is to be given properly and clearly. Hence, I pass the following Order: -

The Opponent to furnish the information in a proper manner i.e. by stating about the queries asked by the Complainant within 10 days from the receipt of the Order. No further intervention is required.

Complaint is accordingly disposed off.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 6<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2010.

Sd/-  
(M. S. Keny)  
State Chief Information Commissioner



