

**GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION  
AT PANAJI**

**CORAM:** Shri Afonso Araujo, State Information Commissioner

Appeal No. 22/SIC/2010

Dr. Aureliano Fernandes,  
Reader, Dept. of Political Science,  
Goa University,  
Taleigao Plateau – Goa

... Appellant.

V/s.

1) Public Information Officer,  
Dr. M. M. Sangodkar,  
Registrar, Goa University,  
Taleigao Plateau – Goa

... Respondent No. 1.

2) First Appellate Authority,  
Dr. Dileep Deobagkar,  
Vice Chancellor, Goa University,  
Taleigao Plateau – Goa

... Respondent No. 2.

Appellant in person.

Smt. A. Agni alongwith Smt. B. Daniel for the Respondents.

**JUDGMENT**

(Per Afonso Araujo)

The Appellant by request dated 24.10.2009 sought information under the RTI Act from the Respondent No. 1 and enumerated at Sr. No. 1 to 18 of the said request. The Respondent No. 1 by communication dated 24.11.2009 provided the information sought at Sr. No. 1 to 18 to the request dated 24.10.2009.

2. Not content with the information provided at Sr. No. 2, 5 and 18 to the request dated 24.10.2009 the Appellant preferred the First Appeal on 27.11.2009. As the First Appellate Authority did not decide the First Appeal, this Second Appeal by the Appellant.

...2/-

3. The grievance of the Appellant is in respect to the answers provided to the queries at Sr. No. 2, 5 and 18. The information sought at Sr. No. 2 the Appellant requires unedited CD recording of the National Workshop on Human Rights on Governance organized by Department of Political Science, Goa University on 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> October, 2008 and the reply by the Opponent is that unedited CD was not available on record. The contention of the Opponent is that the raw footage of the programme of National Workshop on Human Rights on Governance is deleted from the computer system after delivery of the final edited CD. In fact, the edited CD of Human Rights Workshop has been provided to the Appellant and once after preparation of the edited CD by deleting the raw footage or the unedited CD, there is no question of unedited CD remaining with the Public Authority and the Respondent No. 1 cannot provide the information regarding this unedited CD to the Appellant.

4. The information sought at Sr. No. 5 the Appellant requires application letters of students addressed to HOD stating their choice of optional course for first/third semester of 2008-09. The answer is that information not available on record. In the submissions the Respondent No. 1 stated that no such records are in the University records and that the only application on record relates to option offered in Second and Fourth Semester 2008-09. The information sought under RTI Act should be from records and the Public Information Officer cannot provide the information by creating records. It appears that there are no applications of the students regarding the optional course for First and Third Semester of 2008-09 but applications are only relating to option offered in Second/Fourth Semester of 2008-09. As the information sought by the

Appellant is specific to the application regarding optional course for First and Third Semester 2008-09 and there are no such records of such applications for option for First/Third Semester 2008-09, the Respondent No. 1 answered the query to the question at Sr. No. 2.

5. The information sought at Sr. No. 18 the Appellant requires photocopy of the Certificate of Registration of NGO of which Adv. Albertina Almeida is a member and photocopy of the Form of Registration indicating all members of the NGO as approved by and registered with Registrar of Societies, Government of Goa as on 24.04.2009. The reply provided by the Respondent No. 1 is that the information sought at Sr. No. 18 does not pertain to Goa University. If Adv. Albertina Almeida is a member of a particular NGO and whether this NGO is registered with Registrar of Societies, Government of Goa, the Appellant cannot seek such information from the Public Authority of Goa University. And in case Adv. Albertina, as a member of the NGO Goa University has used her services, then the Appellant has to specify the information required and ask the same in a proper manner rather than the way it was sought at Sr. No. 18.

6. Since the information provided by the Respondent No. 1 in the communication dated 24.11.2009 meets the requirements to the information sought in the request dated 24.10.2009 at Sr. No. 2, 5 and 18, there are no reasons to proceed further and the Appeal is disposed off accordingly.

Pronounced on this 11<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2010.



Sd/-  
(Afonso Araujo)  
State Information Commissioner