


**BEFORE THE ORISSA INFORMATION COMMISSION
BHUBANESWAR**

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

Date: 3rd February, 2009

Complaint Case No. 780/2007

Somanatha Parida,
Qrs No.VIM-203,
Sailashree Vihar,
Chandrasekharpur,
Bhubaneswar-751021Complainant



-Vrs-

Public Information Officer,
Office of the Engineer-in-Chief (Civil), Orissa
Bhubaneswar.....Opposite Party

Decision


1. Complainant Somanatha Parida is absent. The same cannot be condoned today under Rule 9 (2) of the Orissa Information Commission (Appeal Procedure) Rules, 2006 as he was specifically noticed to appear today and participate in the proceedings to reach a finality in the matter. He was explicitly informed that in case he fails to appear today the case will be heard exparte on merits. Pradip Kumar Sutar, Executive Engineer-cum-PIO and Narendranath Das, Senior Assistant, office of the Engineer-in-Chief (Civil), Orissa are present. Heard. Perused the case record. This matter arises out of complaint petition dated 18/06/07 and heard earlier on 19/07/08 and 26/11/08.
2. The PIO informed that all the information had been supplied on 07/05/07 to the Complainant as per his form A application dated 08/03/07. He also submitted a chronological date chart indicating the movement of the file for supplying the information under RTI Act as

requested by the Complainant, for kind perusal of the State Commission.

3. It reveals from the record that the Complainant in his form A application dated 08/03/07 had sought information regarding the status of his representation for payment of arrear salary for the period he served on deputation with the Orissa Industrial Infrastructure Development Corporation (IDCO for short), Bhubaneswar. As the Complainant wanted to receive the information by registered post, he was intimated by the PIO to deposit a sum of Rs.22/- towards postal charges vide form B forwarded in their letter no.11827 dated 19/03/07. Accordingly, the Complainant deposited the same on 11/04/07.
4. The PIO further submitted that all the required information had been supplied to the Complainant vide their letter no.18428 dated 07/05/07. As the initial response to deposit the cost to the Complainant was within the time frame of 30 days and there is no delay evident at the level of the PIO, the State Commission pass no orders of penalty. The PIO is exonerated and the case is disposed of and closed. Inform the Complainant.

Pronounced in open proceedings

Given under the hand and seal of the State Commission, this 3rd day of February, 2009.


SCIC
3.2.09