

GOA INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

Appeal No. 42/2008

Shri. Jowett D'Souza,
H. No. 139, Ambeaxir, Sernabatim,
Colva, Salcete – Goa.

.....

Appellant.

V/s.

1. Public Information Officer,
The Superintendent of Police (South),
South District Headquarters,
Margao – Goa.
2. The first Appellate Authority,
The Inspector General of Police,
Police Headquarters, Panaji – Goa.

.....

Respondents.

CORAM:

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

(Per A. Venkataratnam)

Dated: 30/07/2008.

Appellant present in person.

Adv. K. L. Bhagat for both the Respondents.

ORDER

This second appeal arises out of the impugned order dated 7/5/2008 of the Respondent No. 2 in an order passed by him on 7/5/2008. We are concerned with the order passed in respect of first Appeal No. 22/2008. Notices were issued and the Appellant argued for himself. The information initially sought by the Appellant is regarding two files named after himself "Jowett D'Souza" RTI File No. I and II maintained by the office of the Respondent No. 1. It appears that he has earlier asked for and inspected himself both the files. During this inspection, he has found that the files are not "indexed and catalogued" in a manner and form which facilitates the right to information under this Act under section 4(1)(a) of the RTI Act. The Public Information Officer has informed him that the pages in the files are duly numbered and a certificate to this effect are displayed on both the files. The Respondent No. 2 by his impugned order has mentioned that "nowhere in the country either in the State Government or Central Government, individual files are indexed. I am very happy that Shri. Jowett D'Souza is so much concerned about office procedure. But I am in no position to help him, because changing office procedure is beyond my authority."

...2/-

2. The Appellant obviously is confused as to the meaning of indexing and cataloguing mentioned in section 4(1)(a) of the RTI Act. No doubt, it is the duty and obligation of a public authority to maintain, index and catalogue all the records in his department. It does not refer to any individual file. We find that the procedure adopted by the Public Information Officer and Department to page number both the notings as well as correspondence pages in a file is good enough to prevent any "manipulation" of the file as alleged and feared by the Appellant. As the appeal is filed on misapprehension and misunderstanding by the Appellant and has no substance whatsoever, it is hereby dismissed,

3. The appeal is dismissed. The letter of the Public Information Officer and order of the Appellate Authority are upheld.

Pronounced in the open court, on this 30th day of July, 2008.

Sd/-
(A. Venkataratnam)
State Chief Information Commissioner

Sd/-
(G. G. Kambli)
State Information Commissioner