

**BEFORE THE ORISSA INFORMATION COMMISSION  
BHUBANESWAR**

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

**Date: 25<sup>th</sup> February, 2009**

**Complaint Case No. 946/2007**



Pradeep Kumar Pradhan,  
At-Purunapada, Talasahi,  
PO/PS-Bhawanipatna Town,  
Kalahandi district .....Complainant

**-Vrs-**

1. Public Information Officer,  
Office of the Executive Engineer,  
Kalahandi(Roads and Buildings) Division,  
Bhawanipatna,  
Kalahandi district
2. First Appellate Authority,  
Office of the Executive Engineer,  
Kalahandi(Roads and Buildings) Division,  
Kalahandi district..... Opposite Parties

**Decision**

1. Complainant Pradeep Kumar Pradhan is absent. The same is condoned under Rule 9 (2) of the Orissa Information Commission ( Appeal Procedure) Rules, 2006. Saumarjini Sethy, PIO-cum-Assistant Engineer( Estimator), office of the Executive Engineer, Kalahandi ( R & B ) Division, Bhawanipatna is present. This case was last heard on 02/12/08. Heard. Perused the case record. This case arises out of complaint case dated 21/05/07.
2. It is seen from the case record that as per the direction dated 02/12/08 of the State Commission, the PIO, Kalahandi (R & B) Division, Bhawanipatna intimated the Complainant to attend the hearing scheduled to be held today. In spite of the intimation the Complainant is absent.

3. The PIO in her letter no.3778 dated 28/07/07 had stated that the Complainant had in form A application dated 17/02/07 sought the details of the bid amount tendered by one Rajib Lochan Biswal and himself ( Pradeep Kumar Pradhan) for improvement to Purunapada Road (ODR) on 19/10/06 .After receipt of the form A application, the Complainant was intimated in form B vide letter no.1073 dated 28/02/07 to deposit Rs.294/-towards the cost of providing information, as the Complainant had mentioned in his form A application to receive the information in person. But within the stipulated period of 30 days from the date of intimation dated 28/02/07, the Complainant did not deposit the money nor attend the office to collect the information though the information was ready. After expiry of 30 days on 20/03/07 one of the relatives of the Complainant namely Keshari Pradhan came to the office and sought the information but he did not deposit the cost of Rs.294/-. Hence the information was not supplied.
4. In view of the facts and circumstances of this case, the State Commission is of the considered view that there was no malafide intention on the part of the PIO. She is exonerated with no order on penalty. Accordingly, 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 25<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2009.

  
SCIC  
25-2-09

111