

GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION AT PANAJI

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

Appeal No. 76/SCIC/2010

Custodio de Souza,
Porba Vaddo, H. No. 4/234,
Calangute – Goa.

..... Appellant.

V/s.

1. Public Information Officer,
Secretary,
Village Panchayat Calangute,
Bardez – Goa.
2. First Appellate Authority,
Block Development Officer,
Mapusa, Bardez – Goa.

..... Respondents.

Appellant in person.

Respondents absent.

J U D G E M E N T **(03-05-2010)**

1. The Appellant, Custodio de Souza, has preferred this Second Appeal praying for penalty and for a direction that the information sought by the Appellant be furnished.

2. It is seen that by an application dated 4th January, 2010, the Appellant sought certain information from the Secretary, Village Panchayat Calangute/Respondent No. 1. However, he did not receive any reply. The Appellant thereafter preferred First Appeal before the Respondent No. 2. It appears that even after the First Appeal, no information was furnished. Since information is not furnished, the Appellant has preferred this Appeal on the grounds as mentioned in the Memo of Appeal.

3. Matter was fixed for today. However, both the Respondents remained absent.

...2/-

4. During the hearing, the Appellant submitted that by letter dated 27/03/2010, he has received the information from the Public Information Officer. The Appellant was asked specifically whether he is satisfied with the information and he submitted that he has received the information and he has no grievance about the same. The Appellant, however, submits that information has been furnished after the considerable delay.

5. I have carefully gone through the records of the case and it is seen that information was sought on 4th January, 2010 and infact the information has been furnished by letter dated 27/03/2010. Apparently there is delay. The Respondent No. 1 is absent today. Nothing remains in the Appeal in the sense the information has been furnished and that Appellant has no grievance about the information. His only problem is that the same has been furnished after the considerable delay.

6. In the factual backdrop of this case, it appears that information is given but belatedly. Therefore, no further intervention is required in so far as information is concerned.

7. There is delay and since there is delay, the Respondent No. 1 is to be heard on the same and hence, I pass following Order: -

ORDER

No further intervention of this Commission is required in so far as information is concerned. Issue notice under section 20(1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005, Respondent No. 1/Public Information Officer why the penal action should not be taken against him for causing delay in furnishing information. The explanation, if any, should reach the

Commission on 7/6/2010 at 10.30 a.m. Public Information Officer to remain present for hearing.

Posted for inquiry on 07/06/2010 at 10.30 a.m.

Appeal is disposed off.

Pronounced in the Commission on this 3rd day of May, 2010.

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

