

BEFORE THE ORISSA INFORMATION COMMISSION

BHUBANESWAR

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

Date: 20th January,2009

Complaint Case No.389/2007



Bidyadhar Panda,
At-Jharkundamal,
PO-Tarapur,
Via-Dharmagarh,
Kalahandi district.....Complainant

-Vrs-

Public Information Officer,
District Inspector of Schools,
Dharmagarh,
Kalahandi district.....Opposite Party

Decision

1. Complainant Bidyadhar Panda and Basant Kumar Patnaik, Senior Clerk, office of the District Inspector of Schools, Dharamgarh, Kalahandi district are present. Heard and perused the case record.
2. This case was earlier heard thrice on 20.12.2007, 25.04.2008 and 12.09.2008. The Complainant had sought information in his form A application dated 18.11.2006 from the PIO, office of the District Inspector of Schools, Dharamgarh, Kalahandi on 14 items all relating to his service matters. The PIO had mentioned on 20.12.2007 that he had received the application dated 18.11.06 of the Complainant on 20.11.2006 .As the information related to various service matters, he sought certain clarification from the Complainant on 19.12.2006.The latter, on the contrary, had stated on 20.12.07 that he had not received the above communication of the PIO. After hearing as above from both the parties on 20.12.2007, the State Commission had directed the PIO to provide the required information within 15 days i.e. by 5.1.2008, free of cost, and report compliance the State Commission through the Registrar.

3. As per the above directions of the State Commission, the PIO stated that the required information have been supplied to the Complainant, free of cost, letter no.14 dtd. 4.1.2008. The Complainant admitted that he had received all the arrear amounts but the interest amount due thereon has not been given and the Service book provided to him had not been updated. The State Commission were of the view that these were not issues to be considered under the RTI Act,2005. The Complainant may take up the said issues in the appropriate administrative forum. The Complainant also made certain allegations of behavior which cannot be taken cognizance of by the State Commission. He should approach the competent court/authority for redressal.
4. The State Commission upon hearing the PIO were satisfied on his bonafides. Since the Complainant has already received the required information as per his form A application dated 18.11.2006, there is no need to prolong this case. Subject to the observations made supra the case is disposed of and closed with no orders on penalty as the initial response of the PIO seeking clarifications was within the maximum permissible time frame.

Pronounced in open proceedings

Given under the hand and seal of the State Commission, this 20th day of January,2009.


SCIC
20-1-09