

**BEFORE THE ORRISA INFORMATION COMMISSION  
BHUBANESWAR**

**Present:- :- Hon'ble Sri D.N. Padhi, SCIC  
And  
Prof. Radhamohan, SIC**

**Dated:- 27<sup>th</sup> September, 2006**

**Complaint Case No 131/2006**

Sri Janardana Samataray,  
CE-115, Baramunda Housing,  
Board Colony,  
PO-Baramunda,  
Bhubaneswar-751003,  
Khurda District.....Complainant

-Vrs-

1. Sri Subodh Ch. Mohapatra  
Public Information Officer,  
Collectorate,  
Jajpur.
2. Shri T.S. Chakrabarty,  
Deputy Secretary,  
Revenue Department,  
Secretariat  
Bhubaneswar.....Opposite Parties

**Decision**

1. Complainant Sri Janardana Samantaray is absent but in view of the statutory relief available to him under Rule 9(2) of the Orissa Information Commission (Appeal Procedure) Rules, 2006 his absence will not adversely affect the merits/outcome of the case. Thus the case is heard in presence of the PIO of the Revenue Department of the Govt. and the PIO of Jajpur Collectorate. Perused the records.
2. It reveals from the application dated 08/02/06 submitted by the Complainant in form, 'A' u/S 6 of the RTI Act, 2005 (Act for short) in the Revenue Department and put up to the PIO of the Department on 15/02/06 that the PIO transferred the same u/S 6 (3) of the Act on


20/02/06 to the PIO of Jajpur Collectorate as the information related to the said PIO. He also intimated the Complainant about the same. PIO of the Revenue Department, therefore, stand exonerated of his responsibilities.

3. Unfortunately the letter was mis-sent to Angul Collectorate which after being redirected was received by the PIO of Jajpur Collectorate on 12/04/06. On that very day the PIO requested the assistance of his Additional District Magistrate to supply the information and the latter supplied the information to the PIO on 29/04/06. The PIO forthwith intimated the Complainant the very same day to deposit fees for the information. But as they required fees were not deposited by the Complainant, the information could be supplied.
4. Though the record shows that the Complainant has sent Rs.10/- by money order to the PIO Jajpur Collectorate, the PIO submits not to have received any such amount by money order. From the copy of the money order receipt attached to the case record the bonafides of the Complainant is established.
5. Considering the controversy that amount has been sent by money order which is allegedly not received by the PIO, the State Commission feels it appropriate to direct the PIO, Jajpur Collectorate to supply the information free of cost by Registered post with A/D within 7 days to the address of the Complainant under intimation to the PIO of the Revenue Department.
6. With the above direction the case of the Complainant is allowed.

**Pronounced**

Given under the hand and seal of the State Commission, this the 27<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2006.



  
**Hon'ble SCIC**  
27-9-06  
Anurag K. Mishra  
SIC