

BEFORE THE ORISSA INFORMATION COMMISSION

BHUBANESWAR

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

Date: 5th February, 2008

Complaint Case No.08/2007



Sankarsan Parida,
At/PO-Binjabahal,
Via-Telkoi,
Keonjhar District.....Complainant

-Vrs-

Public Information Officer,
Office of DFO (Kendu Leaf)
Keonjhar Division
Keonjhar District..... Opposite Party

Decision

1. Complainant Sankarsan Parida is absent. His absence is condoned under Rule 9 (2) of Orissa Information Commission (Appeal Procedure) Rules, 2006. Rama Chandra Naik, PIO-cum-Head Clerk, office of the Divisional Forest Officer, (K.L.) Keonjhar Division is present. Heard. Perused the case record.
2. The case was earlier heard on 29/08/07 and 27/09/07. It was on 29/08/07 when the State Commission had directed the PIO to refund the excess Rs. 10/- to the Complainant since the application fees has been revised downwards to Rs. 10/- from Rs.20/- by the time of filing of application. The PIO was present on 29/08/07 but absent on 27/09/07 despite taking note of the fresh date of hearing. The present PIO submitted that ex-PIO, Birendra Krushna Samal had retired on 30/11/07 on attaining the age of

superannuation. It is unfortunate that Birendra Kumar Samal had not appeared on the last date of hearing. This is a act of insubordination which is seriously viewed. Copy of the order be communicated to him at his known address by the Divisional Forest Officer, (Kendu Leaf) Keonjhar Division.

3. Ramachandra Naik submitted that as per the directions of the State Commission he had refunded Rs.10/- to the Complainant under proper receipt and had asked the Complainant vide letter no. 4480 dated 17/09/07, to receive information on payment of Rs.100/- towards cost of information. This letter was sent by under certificate of posting. Copy of which is available on the record.
4. Suffice it to mention that the Complainant had not properly filled up form A application dated 28/07/06. He is assisted by the State Commission on 29/08/07 in making necessary corrections which he willingly did. Therefore, no delay can be attributed to anybody. The PIO is directed to write a letter to the Complainant under certificate of posting to deposit the cost and collect the information by 23/02/08 failing which the PIO can reject the request.
5. In view of the above position, the case is disposed of and closed. Inform the Complainant.

Pronounced

Given under the hand and seal of the State Commission, this 5th day of February, 2008.




Hon'ble SCIC

5-2-08