

**BEFORE THE ORISSA INFORMATION COMMISSION
BHUBANESWAR**

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

Shri Jagadananda, SIC

Date:15th January, 2009

Complaint Case No. 100/2007

Tanmaya Kumar Sahoo,
At-Hukutola,
PO-Manijanga,
Jagatsinghpur districtComplainant



-Vrs-

Public Information Officer,
Directorate of Higher Education,
Heads of Department Building, Orissa,
Bhubaneswar.....Opposite Party

Decision

1. Complainant Tanmay Kumar Sahoo is absent. The same is condoned under Rule 9 (2) of the Orissa Information Commission (Appeal Procedure) Rules, 2006. Suman Mohapatra, Director, Rajat Kumar Mohapatra, Deputy Director, Dharendra Kumar Sarangi, ex-Deputy Director, Sourjya Ranjan Parija, PIO-cum- Deputy Director, Umakanta Sahu,. ex-PIO and Purnendu Pattanaik, Senior Assistant, Directorate of Higher Education, Orissa, Bhubaneswar are present. Heard. Perused the case record. This case arises out of complaint petition dated 01/02/07.
2. The Complainant had solicited information in his RTI form A application dated 19/12/06 from the PIO, Directorate of Higher Education, Orissa seeking particulars of the form A annexure to the grant-in-aid proposal for 1996 submitted by Principal, Sudarshan Mohavidyalaya, 42 Mouza, Cuttack district and other allied documents. His grievance was that he had not received the annexure attached to the grant –in-aid proposal. The case was earlier heard

on 19/09/07, 17/01/08, 17/07/08 and 30/09/08. The PIO had stated that the documents requested relate to the year 1996 and after making efforts to trace out the old records, the Deputy Director submitted the required documents to the PIO on 18/01/07. In order to avoid the delay, the Complainant was informed over telephone to deposit Rs.68/- towards cost of information on 18/01/07, the Complainant deposited the cost on 25/01/07 and information supplied on 31/01/07. The Complainant had questioned the basis of the statement of the PIO by saying that if allied documents could be available, why the annexures attached to grant-in-aid proposal could not be furnished. The PIO had stated that the information sought for by the Complainant was not specific and hence could not comply to the satisfaction of the Complainant.

3. The State Commission on 17/01/08 had directed the PIO to streamline the record room management and discover the document and provide the same to the Complainant. The balance information had been supplied to the Complainant on 30/09/08 in compliance to the orders of the Commission. Sumon Mohapatra, Director stated that in obedience to the orders of the State Commission the record room management has been streamlined.
4. In view of the above the case is disposed of and closed.

Pronounced in open proceedings.

Given under the hand and seal of the State Commission, this 15th day of January, 2009.

SCIC

SIC
15/1/09

201