

**BEFORE THE ORISSA INFORMATION COMMISSION
BHUBANESWAR**

Present: Shri Jagadananda, SIC

Date: 14th January, 2009

Complaint Case No. 1030 / 2007

Sushanta Lahajal,
At/PO-Dharmgarh-766015,
Kalahandi District.....Complainant

-Vrs-

Public Information Officer,
office of the Sub-Divisional Veterinary Officer,
Dharmgarh-766015,
Kalahandi DistrictOpposite Party



Decision


1. Complainant Sushanta Lahajal is absent. His absence is condoned under Rule 9(2) of the Orissa Information Commission (Appeal Procedure) Rules, 2006. Udhab Behera, Head Clerk-cum-PIO, office of the Sub-Divisional Veterinary Officer, Dharmagarh, Kalahandi district (D.V.O for short) is also absent. Perused the case record.
2. This case was last heard on 23/09/08. The Complainant sought for information about the proactive disclosure as required under Section 4(1)(b) of the RTI Act, 2005 (Act for short) and dissemination thereof on the notice board by the Public Authority by submitting an application in form A on 03/04/07.
3. During hearing of this case on 23/09/08 the PIO stated that in an interim reply dated on 01/05/07 he had intimated the Complainant about the details of the said pro-active disclosure. He had further stated that due to crunch of

financial resources, the dissemination work has not been done. However he communicated an assurance to the Complainant that the information shall be published as soon as funds are received from the Government by the public authority. He had further stated that in the meanwhile funds have been received for the purpose and they have initiated action to disseminate the information as per the above statutory need.

4. However the State Commission is of the opinion that each and every Public Authority including the office of SDVO, Dharmgarh, Kalahandi district are expected to discharge their legal obligation to fulfill the mandatory requirement of provisions of Section 4 of the Act. The State Commission direct the PIO to inform the Complainant at the earliest to inspect the said work of dissemination of information. The Complainant was afforded with opportunity to have his say in the case but he is absent. Hence it is reasonably informed that he had no other issue to raise in the case. Accordingly the case is disposed of and closed subject to the compliance of the direction supra by the PIO of the Public Authority. Inform both the parties.

Pronounced in open proceedings.

Given under the hand and seal of the State Commission, this 14th day of January, 2009.


14/1/09
SIC