

## **GOA INFORMATION COMMISSION**

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

Appeal No. 102/2006/VP Mercedes

Shri John Nazareth  
H. No. 71, Gaunchem Bhatt,  
Merces - Goa.

..... Appellant.

V/s.

1. Public Information Officer  
Village Panchayat Secretary,  
V.P. Merces, Merces - Goa.
2. First Appellate Authority  
The Director,  
Directorate of Panchayats,  
Panaji - 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: 26/06/2007.

Appellant in person.

Respondent No. 1 also in person.

Shri Nilesh D. Sawant, authorized representative for the Respondent No. 2  
present.

### **ORDER**

The short point here is whether the reply given by Respondent No. 1, the Public Information Officer, is incomplete as alleged by the Appellant in his second appeal dated 21/3/2007. On issuing notices, an Advocate appeared on behalf of the Respondent No.1. However, no vakalatnama is on record and no name is on record on file and hence, we ignore his presence. Both the Respondents have filed their written submissions. The Appellant by his request for information dated 13/10/2006 approached the Public Information Officer, namely, Village Panchayat Secretary, Village Panchayat of Merces to provide

...2/-

him certain information as per para No. 5 of his request. From para No. 6 onwards he has also asked for the general information in respect of releasing of electric and water connections and the collections of the house tax from shops, flats/buildings prior to grant of occupancy certificates by the Panchayat of Mercedes during the last ten years. The Public Information Officer replied for all the points of para No. 5 of the request by his letter dated 20/12/2006 and stated that the information regarding the para 6, 7 and 8 would be submitted to him in due course of time. Not satisfied with this reply, the first appeal has been filed before the Director of Panchayats. Both of them have submitted their written statements before us.

2. The Respondent No. 1 took the plea that whatever information was readily available was immediately given and more time was required for giving the remaining information, as it is for a period of ten years. He has also submitted that he is holding additional charge of some other Panchayat and accordingly more time was taken by him to reply to the Appellant. The Respondent No. 2, on the other hand, has taken the plea that he has disposed off the matter immediately and directed the issuance of entire information as early as possible. It is not, however, on record whether the remaining information though voluminous, has been given to the Appellant or not. We have gone through the records of the statements of the Respondents and are satisfied there is no intentional delay by the Respondent No. 1 in furnishing information. We are, therefore, not inclined to grant the request of the Appellant to start penalty proceedings or recommend disciplinary action against the Respondent No. 1. However, as per the Right to Information Act, the information has to be given, though voluminous. We direct the Respondent No. 1 to give the complete information in next 30 days and report compliance to us. The appeal is disposed off accordingly partly allowing it.

Parties should be informed.

(A. Venkataratnam)  
State Chief Information Commissioner

(G. G. Kambli)  
State Information Commissioner

