


**BEFORE THE ORRISA INFORMATION COMMISSION
BHUBANESWAR**

Present:- :- Prof. Radhamohan, SIC

Dated:- 14th September, 2006

Complaint Case No 100/2006



Sri Raj Kishore Debata,
Rajadhanipura,
Ward No-6,
Kuchinda NAC,
PO/PS-Kuchinda
Sambalpur District.....Complainant

-Vrs-

1. Sri Himansu bhusan Mahanda,
Public Information Officer,
Notified Area Council,
Kuchinda.
2. Sri Prakash Naryan Sharma,
Executive Officer NAC, Kuchinda
1st Appellate Authority,
PO/PS-Kuchinda
Sambalpur DistrictOpposite Parties

Decision

1. The Complainant and both the Opposite Parties of Kuchinda NAC are present. Heard both sides in detail. Perused the case record.
2. Shorn of irrelevant factual details the Complainant sought for some information from the PIO on 27/12/05 in Form 'A' u/S 6 of the RTI Act, 2005 (Act for short).
3. The PIO after making due assessment intimated the Complainant on 28/12/05 to deposit Rs. 715/- towards fees for preparation of the information. The Complainant deposited the said amount on 30/12/05.
4. The Complainant submits to have received some information in time but not the complete information from the PIO submits that the NSDP work estimate and work order for the market complex near the Bus Stand have not been supplied to him. The PIO has clearly intimated writing on 25/01/06 that the

process of selection of contractors is being processed for the construction of the market complex near Kuchinda Bus Stand. Thus the Complainant's application for information on that score is premature. The Opposite Parties submit that in the meantime the exercise on the above score by the Kuchinda NAC is complete and they are prepared to provide the information. The opposite party supplied the said information to the complainant in presence of the State Commission during hearing of this case.

5. There appears no delay to have been caused by the Opposite Parties supplying the available information to the Complainant. Therefore though violation of the provision of Section 7 of the Act has been alleged by the Complainant it does not stand to the test of legal scrutiny.
6. For the reasons aforesaid the case of the Complainant is found to be devoid on merit, which is dismissed.

Pronounced

Given under the hand and seal of the State Commission, this the 14th day of September, 2006.



Am Kumar
SIC