

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION  
AT PANAJI**

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

Appeal No. 129/SIC/2009

Nilesh V. Nagvekar,  
Flat No. 2/D, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Hill Crown Apts.,  
Near Saldanha Business Towers,  
Mapusa,  
Bardez – Goa

... Appellant.

V/s.

1) The Public Information Officer,  
Mamlatdar of Bardez,  
Mapusa,  
Bardez – Goa

... Respondent No. 1.

2) The First Appellate Authority,  
Deputy Director of North Goa,  
Bardez – Goa

... Respondent No. 2.

Appellant in person.

Authorized representative Smt. S. Morajkar for Respondent No. 1

**ORDER**

Information was sought under the Right to Information Act, 2005 by the Appellant at Sr. No. (a) to (l) of his request dated 19.08.2009 which consist of documents pertaining to Mutation Case No. 1451/98/Sangolda. In this Appeal the grievance of the Appellant is that information sought at Sr. (d), (e) and (g) was not given and requires the same to be provided to the Appellant.

2. The information sought in the request dated 19.09.2009 at Sr. (d) is the certified copy of Notice No.XII; (e) Notice given to the concerned person to remain present for the hearing dated 26.11.2008 at Mamlatdar Office at Mapusa; (g) Receipt of A.D. Cards returned in confirmation of acknowledge of letter.

The Respondent No. 1 stated that whatever was available was provided to the Appellant by letter No. NAM/BAR/RTI/471/09 dated 01.09.2009 and that as the documents at Sr. (d), (e) and (g), were not in the file, the same could not be provided to the Appellant.

...2/-

3. In fact the information sought at Sr. (d), (e) and (g) is in respect of Notice in form No. XII for the parties to remain present at the hearing in Mamlatdar's office and the A.D. cards in the file of Mutation Case. It may be pointed out here that the information at Sr. (c), the Appellant requires a certified copy of Notice in Form No. X which indicates that the notices to all the persons concerned in the Mutation Case has been issued to them. As the documents at Sr. (d), (e) and (g) were not in the Mutation file the Respondent No. 1 could not provide the same to the Appellant. Hence, there are no reasons to proceed further and the Appeal is disposed off.

Pronounced on this 12<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2010.

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