

BEFORE THE ORISSA INFORMATION COMMISSION  
BHUBANESWAR


Present: Hon'ble Shri D.N.Padhi, SCIC

and

Shri Jagadananda, SIC

Date: 19<sup>th</sup> February, 2009

Complaint Case No. 1066/2007



Arjuna Sahoo,  
Advocate,  
At-Patapurpatana-752091,  
PO-Satpatna,  
Nayagarh District ..... Complainant

-Vrs-

1. Public Information Officer,  
Office of the Principal Brundaban Subudhi College,  
Daspalla,  
Nayagarh,
2. First Appellate Authority,  
Office of the Principal Brundaban Subudhi College,  
Daspalla,  
Nayagarh,  
Nayagarh District ..... Opposite Parties

Decision


1. Complainant Arjuna Sahoo is absent. The same is condoned under Rule 9(2) of the Orissa Information Commission (Appeal Procedure) Rules, 2006. Guru Prasad Das, PIO and Saroj Kumar Nayak, ex-Principal of Brundaban Subudhi College, Daspalla. Nayagarh district are present. Heard. Perused the case record. This case arises out of complaint petition dated 21/07/07 and earlier heard by the State Commission on 29/10/08.
2. The Complainant in form A application dated 19/04/07 filed with the PIO, Brundaban Subudhi College, Dasapalla had sought (i) photocopies of the attendance of all +3 non-teaching staff from 2001 to 2006, (ii) parawise report submitted before Lokpal in case no. 873/2006 etc. The PIO stated that


the application of the Complainant was received by the then PIO on 23/04/07 and Complainant intimated on 27/06/07 to receive the information. But the Complainant did not turn up. The PIO stated that he was ready with the information.

3. On being directed by the State Commission on 29/10/08, to provide the same, free of cost, to the Complainant (who was present), the PIO complied with the same immediately.
4. The PIO stated today that prior to letter dated 27/06/07 he had intimated the Complainant on 04/05/07 to deposit Rs. 80/- towards cost of providing information to which he had not responded. This was not controverted by the Complainant. It was with the intervention of the State Commission the required information had been supplied, free of cost, to the Complainant, though the fault lay with the latter.
5. On perusal of the record and hearing the PIO, he is exonerated and the case is disposed of and closed. Inform the Complainant.

**Pronounced in open proceedings**

Given under the hand and seal of the State Commission, this 19<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2009.

  
SCIC 19.2.09

  
SIC 19/2/09