

**BEFORE THE ORISSA INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**BHUBANESWAR**

**Present: Shri Jagadananda, SIC**

**Date: 1<sup>st</sup> September, 2008**

**Complaint Case No. 288/2008**

Sashibhusan Rath,  
Vill-Begunia,  
PS/PO-Begunia,  
Khurda District ..... Complainant

**-Vrs-**

1. Public Information Officer  
Office of the Block Development Officer,  
Panchayat Samiti, Begunia,  
Khurda District
2. First Appellate Authority  
Office of the Block Development Officer,  
Panchayat Samiti, Begunia,  
Khurda District ..... Opposite Parties



**Decision**

1. Complainant Sashibhusan Rath is present. Gobinda Chandra Moharana, Progress Assistant-cum-PIO, Abdul Ahim Khan, Block Development Officer-cum-First Appellate Authority, Nilakantha Mohanty, S.I. of Schools, Begunia Block Office are present. Heard and perused the case record. The case is being heard for the first time.
2. The Complainant filed form A application on 27/11/07 seeking information on 5 items with the PIO, Block Development Office, Begunia. The PIO has responded vide letter no.XII-29 dated 25/12/07 informing about processing of his request and the same were made available to the Complainant on 02/01/08. The Complainant has received the same and availed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 02/01/08. In the absence of due disposal by the First Appellate Authority he preferred second appeal at the State Commission on 21/02/08.

80/9/11  
126

3. On perusal of the record and the information provided to the Complainant in response to his form A application it is noted that the PIO has advised the applicant about approaching the various Public Authorities separately as to fulfill his information need through inspection of records since the records pertain to five different institutions. With regard to the information sought by the applicant, the PIO has stated to have informed that the information sought are personal in nature and since it involves third party disclosure, the same are unavailable.
4. During the course of hearing it was stated by the officials of the Public Authority that the applicant is seeking a variety of application through multiple applications from different Public Authorities. For the self same information he had also made an application with another Public Authority. The Complainant is also, therefore, advised to prioritize his information need.
5. After going through the records and hearing from the PIO, First Appellate Authority and the Complainant, the Commission considers this as an appropriate case to be remanded to the First Appellate Authority with a direction to adjudicate the case of the Complainant with a reasoned order as per the RTI Act expeditiously ensure provision of permissible information to the applicant on items no. 3, 4 and 5 within a period of four weeks.
6. Subject to the compliance of the order of the Commission, the case is disposed of and closed.

**Pronounced in open proceedings.**

Given under the hand and seal of the State Commission, this 1<sup>st</sup> day of September, 2008.



*[Handwritten Signature]*  
SIC 1/9/08