

GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

Appeal No. 91/2006/MAM

Shri Suresh D. Naik
H. No. 124/4/6,
Gaunsawado, Mapusa - Goa.

..... Appellant.

V/s.

1. Public Information Officer
The Mamlatdar of Pernem taluka,
Office of the Mamlatdar of Pernem,
Pernem - Goa.
2. First Appellate Authority
The Dy Collector,
Bardez -II for Pernem Taluka,
Pernem - 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: 22/03/2007.

Adv. Pranay Kamat present for the Appellant.

Respondent No. 1 and 2 in person.

ORDER

This disposes off the second appeal made on 23/2/2007 against the order dated 19/1/2007 of the Respondent No. 2. The Appellant by his application dated 18/09/2006 approached the Respondent No. 1 to clarify as to how a figure, "641" was entered in the Form No. III in respect of survey No. 232/1, 234/1 and 235/1 in the village of Varconda, Pernem taluka and to give him the records of the disputed case, if any, in respect of above three survey numbers. This request was initially transferred by the Respondent No. 1 to the Inspector of Survey and Land records believing that the original records are with his office. The Land Survey Inspector returned back the application with the remarks stating that his office does not have the original records, having transferred them to the office of the Respondent No. 1 soon after the promulgation of record of rights. While stating this, the Land Survey Department has also given information that there is

...2/-

no dispute in case in respect of above three sub-division in his office. Having not received any reply within the 30 days time limit, the Appellant approached the first Appellate Authority who has rejected the request by his order dated 19/1/2007. While rejecting the request, the Dy. Collector mentioned that the No. 641 appearing in the three survey numbers mentioned by the Appellant is Khata number and not the D.C. number. Here Khata number is to be understood as the account number of an individual/institution, wherein all the lands of which he/it is the occupant in the revenue village are recorded at one place. The D.C. number is in an acronym for the disputed cases. The Respondent No. 2 has rejected the appeal as there is no more information to be provided and so called clarification is already given. Against this, the Appellant has submitted his second appeal still maintaining that the information was not provided to him.

2. On the issuance of notices, Adv. Pranay Kamat appeared for the Appellant and Respondents argued the case in person. They have also submitted their written statements in which Respondent No. 1 has taken up plea that the Dy. Collector has already clarified that No.641 appearing in above sub-division is a Khata number and the application for request for information stands disposed. The Dy. Collector also confirmed the same in his written statement. We find that there is no merit in the appeal as the matter stands clarified as to what is meant by No. 641. If the Appellant has got any further doubt, he has to make another fresh application for the copy of all the records of the Khata number. As this was not asked earlier, this does not form part of the present appeal. The appeal, therefore, is rejected.

(A. Venkataratnam)
State Chief Information Commissioner

(G. G. Kambli)
State Information Commissioner