

# **GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

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

Complaint No. 6/2006/

Smt. Agnes D'Silva  
R/o Vignesh ward,  
Maddo waddo, Calangute.

.....

Complainant.

V/s.

Public Information Officer,  
Village Panchayat of Calangute,  
Naika wadda, Bardez - Goa.

.....

Opponent.

## **CORAM :**

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

(Per A. Venkataratnam)

Dated: 28/09/2006.

Complainant in person.

Adv. Pranay Kamat for opponent.

## **ORDER**

This disposes off a complaint against the Village Panchayat of Calangute dated 22/6/2006. The complainant has approached the opponent by her letter dated 3/5/2006 seeking information on 6 points. The opponent vide their letter dated 12/6/2006 sent an incomplete and vague reply against which she filed the present complaint. While the complaint is being heard by us, the opponent has sent 2 letters on 22/7/2006 and 21/9/2006 furnishing detailed information on the points raised by the opponent. When the final hearing has taken place on 22/9/2006, the complainant has handed over another letter to us saying that the information is incomplete.

2. The Learned Adv. Pranay Kamat has mentioned that the records of the opponent are not properly maintained and that his client has taken pains to compile information as much as possible after the matter was brought to the notice of this Commission and that the opponent will clarify and furnish all the information which is further requested by the complainant. As to the specific request dated 3/5/2006 of the complainant, he submitted that all relevant information has already been supplied.

...2/-

3. The question raised by the complainant is about the number of cases in various Courts, High Court and the Tribunal in the last 5 years in which Village Panchayat of Calangute is involved. No doubt, the reply of the opponent on 12/6/2006 that the Court cases are looked by Adv. Pranay Kamat is incomplete. However, by 2 letters subsequently given by the opponent, the complete chart of the cases pending in all the Courts, the results of each case and the fees paid is already mentioned. As such, we are of view that the information was given by the opponent completely though belatedly. Similarly, other questions regarding the amount spent by the Panchayat for the last 5 years and the decisions in favour or against Panchayat are given in the statement enclosed to the opponent's letter dated 21/9/2006. To this the complainant has submitted that the amount specified on 21/9/2006 does not tally. This information was submitted by the opponent for the first time only on 21/9/2006. As such, it is not clear as how this information does not tally and with what amount it does not tally. The objection taken now has no basis. It appears from her letter submitted to the Commission at the time of final hearing the complainant is confused with the Advocate fees for 2005-06 namely Rs.2,43,610/- with the expenditure incurred by the opponent in the last 5 years namely Rs.8,18,555/-. This is bound to be so because both the periods are different from each other. We find, therefore, no merit in the objection raised by the complainant. As the information is supplied by the opponent, and as we are satisfied with the explanation given by them, we hereby reject the complaint.

Pronounced in open Court.

(A. Venkataratnam)  
State Chief Information Commissioner, GOA.

(G.G. Kambli)  
State Information Commissioner, GOA.