

GOA INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

Appeal No. 43/SCIC/2008

Shri. Namdev Chandrakant Chopdekar,
Plot No. 55, Goa Housing Board Colony,
Uphas Nagar, Sancaole – Goa.

..... Appellant.

V/s.

1. Public Information Officer,
The Principal,
M. E. S. Higher Secondary School,
Zuarinagar – Goa.
2. The first Appellate Authority,
The Director,
Directorate of Education,
Panaji – Goa.

..... Respondents.

CORAM:

Shri A. Venkataratnam
State Chief Information Commissioner

(Per A. Venkataratnam)

Dated: 24/07/2008.

Adv. Pednekar for the Appellant.

Respondent No. 1 in person. Shri. Avinash V. Nasnodkar, authorized representative for the Respondent No. 2.

ORDER

The Appellant has approached the Respondent No. 1 with a request for information under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act for short). This is about a "staff notice dated 30/11/2007" issued earlier by the Respondent No. 1 to all the staff of the school including the Appellant. The Respondent No. 1 initially denied the information whereupon the first appeal is filed before the Respondent No. 2. On hearing the parties, the Respondent No. 2 by her impugned order dated 25/02/2008 "disposed off" the appeal as Public Information Officer agreed to provide the information and also because she agreed to withdraw the staff notice dated 30/11/2007 given earlier by the Respondent No. 1. On the same date, namely, 25/02/2008 a reply was given by the Public Information Officer to Respondent No. 2 i.e. first Appellate Authority. There is nothing on record to show whether any reply was given to the Appellant by the Respondent No. 1. However, the Appellant has agreed to have received

...2/-

the reply to 5 points raised by him earlier except for points 3, 5 and 6. The questions themselves are very lengthy. Whatever I could make out of it, the Appellant wanted to know whether "educational achievements and extra curriculum achievements" are two separate categories to be included in the curriculum vitae of the Appellant; whether the special casual leave is available for both activities and finally what did the representative of the Directorate of Education say at a meeting convened by the school managing committee. I find from the replies submitted by both the Respondents that these 3 points were not answered. The Respondent No. 1, Public Information Officer is hereby directed to give the above information immediately and in any case within the next one week from the date of the pronouncement of this order.

2. The appeal is allowed. Consequently, the impugned order is set aside.

Pronounced in the open court, on this 24th day of July, 2008.

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