

BEFORE THE ORISSA INFORMATION COMMISSION

BHUBANESWAR

Present: Shri Jagadananda, SIC

Date: 06th March, 2009

Complaint Case No. 136/2006



Mohan Pani,
Ex-Industries Promotion Officer,
District Industries Centre,
Rayagada District.....Complainant

-Vrs-

Public Information Officer,
District Industries Centre,
Rayagada District..... Opposite Party

Decision


1. Complainant Mohan Pani is absent. On behalf of the Complainant Learned Counsel S. N. Pattanayak is present and filed his Vakalatanama. The same is accepted. Purna Chandra Mohankudo , PIO, District Industries Centre, Rayagada is present. Heard. Perused the case record.
2. The case arises out of a complaint petition dated 07/07/06. The case was substantially heard on 03.10.06, 13.12.06, 28.02.07, 04.04.07, 01.05.07, 03.08.07, 08.11.07 and lastly on 12.11.08.
3. Records reveal that the RTI application of the Complainant in form A was submitted on 07/11/05 seeking information on disciplinary proceedings, recovery details and other related issues from the PIO, office of the District Industries Centre, Rayagada. In his written submission dated 28/02/07, the PIO had submitted that on receipt of the RTI application, the Complainant who was working as Industries Promotion Officer under the same

establishment of the District Industries Centre was requested in form B to deposit the cost of information amounting to Rs.86/- containing 43 pages on 04/12/06. The copy of the letter addressed to the Complainant and its acknowledgement is available on record.

4. The PIO further submitted that the Complainant had visited the Public Authority but did not deposit the cost of information. As a result the information could not be furnished.
5. After hearing the submission of the PIO the State Commission is of the opinion that the RTI application dated 07/11/05 has been attended to by the PIO on 04/12/05 i.e. within the stipulated period as defined under Section 7(1) of the RTI Act, 2005.
6. The State Commission express its concern with the turn of events in this case. The Complainant, who has been an officer in the same Public Authority has utilized the RTI Act for dealing with simple administrative matters within the same office and by not depositing the legitimate cost of information has demonstrated disregard to the provisions of the Act.
7. The case is devoid of any merit and accordingly closed and disposed of. Inform all concerned.

Pronounced in open proceedings

Given under the hand and seal of the State Commission, this 18th day of February, 2009.


SIC 18/2/09

22