

GOA INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

Appeal No. 09/2007-08/VP-Navelim

Shri Francis Rodrigues
Chamber No. 60,
Old Market, Margao - Goa.

..... Appellant.

V/s.

1. Public Information Officer
The Secretary,
V.P. Navelim,
Salcete - Goa.
2. First Appellate Authority
Block Development Officer
Salcete Taluka, Margao - Goa.

..... Respondents.

CORAM:

Shri A. Venkataratnam
State Chief Information Commissioner
&
Shri G. G. Kambli
State Information Commissioner

(Per A. Venkataratnam)

Under Section 19 (3) of the RTI Act, 2005 (Central Act 22 of 2005)

Dated: 13/06/2007.

Appellant absent.

Respondent No. 1 and 2 in person.

ORDER

This disposes off the second appeal dated 24/04/2007 filed by the Appellant against the Secretary, V.P. Navelim who is the Public Information Officer and the Respondent No. 1 herein and the Block Development Officer, Salcete, Respondent No. 2 herein. The facts are that a request was made for certain information by the Appellant to the Respondent No. 1 on 29/11/2006 asking for certain documents which were provided on 3/2/2007. The first appeal was filed on 1/3/2007 alleging delay in the submission and incomplete reply. The first appeal was filed on 1/3/2007 which was disposed off by the Block Development Officer, Respondent No. 2 herein, on 17/03/2007. The second appeal was filed by the Appellant on 24/4/2007 stating that the information given was incomplete and given late.

...2/-

2. The information asked for is in respect of five houses constructed and the house numbers allotted to five individuals in the V.P. Navelim. The Public Information Officer replied that only two persons were given the house numbers and in the remaining three cases, no house numbers were allotted. In respect of a house constructed by Damanciano Fernandes, a house number was allotted. Other information like when it was repaired, whether the plans were approved at the time of construction and whether the laws/rules were fulfilled before house numbers are allotted, the Panchayat replied that the information is either not available or plans were not approved. The grievance of the Appellant is that the answers were not specific to the questions raised by him. On the other hand, in respect of two cases where house numbers were allotted by the Panchayat, it was stated clearly that the Panchayat licence were given only in one case. In the other case, no documents based on which the construction licence was issued are available. Thus, a clear reply was given that the plans were not approved in the case of Fernandes. Copy of the minutes of the Panchayat have been provided in the case of both the houses by Khadir Bepari and Damanciano Fernandes. The action taken or proposed to be taken against Damanciano Fernandes were not specified by the Panchayat and we do not find any question to that effect also. We find that in respect of other cases, no information was given, as it was not available with the Panchayat. The Public Information Officer did not mention the action proposed to be taken on illegal constructions, as there is no specific question to that effect. We, therefore, partly allow the appeal with the direction to supply more information regarding H. No. 214/4 by Damanciano Fernandes for which no plans or other documents are not given by the Public Information Officer within 10 days from the date of this order.

(A. Venkataratnam)
State Chief Information Commissioner

(G. G. Kamblu)
State Information Commissioner