

**BEFORE THE ORISSA INFORMATION COMMISSION  
BHUBANESWAR**

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

**And**

**Professor Radhamohan**

**Date: 29th January, 2008**

**Complaint Case No.404/2007**



Brajamohan Sinku,  
Divisional Accounts Officer,  
PH Division, Rourkela,  
At/PO-Panposh-769004  
Sundargarh District.....Complainant

-Vrs-

Public Information Officer  
General Administration Department,  
Government of Orissa,  
Secretariat,  
Bhubaneswar.....Opposite Party

**Decision**

1. Complainant Brajamohan Sinku is absent. His absence is condoned as per Rule 9 (2) of the Orissa Information Commission (Appeal Procedure) Rules, 2006. Pradeep Kumar Nayak, PIO-cum-Additional Land Officer, General Administration Department, Secretariat, Bhubaneswar (GA Department for short) is present. Heard. Perused the case record.

2. The PIO in obedience to the directions to him by the State Commission in order dated 03/01/08 in this case had reported compliance vide memo no.5/ARC dated 04/01/08 which was received in the State Commission on 07/01/08. He has mentioned therein that the information consisting of 26 pages were provided to the Complainant, free of cost, as directed. Although he was directed to come with the person(s) who had received the Demand Draft sent by the Complainant towards cost of providing information, he submitted that the bank draft was not received in the Department within the time prescribed under rule 4 (3) of the Orissa Right to Information Rules, 2005 for which he had rejected the request of the Complainant.
3. The PIO further submits that the bank draft which was belatedly received after its prescribed validity period in the GA Department has also been returned while complying with the directions of the State Commission dated 03/01/08.
4. Considering the above factual positions that the application has been rejected by the PIO of the GA Department for want of deposit of money towards cost of providing information and that the bank draft which had been belatedly received in the GA Department was returned to him, the State Commission is of the view that no action is legally called for against the PIO or any other officer of the General Administration Department. Moreover, in the meantime, all the information have been supplied to the Complainant, free of cost, which adds to the bonafides of the PIO of the Department.

5. In view of the aforementioned facts and circumstances of the case, there is no need to prolong this case which is hereby closed and disposed of. Inform the Complainant.

**Pronounced**

Given under the hand and seal of the State Commission, this 29<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2008.



**Hon'ble SIC**

29-1-08

*Newhaman*  
**SIC**