



**Before the State Information Commission, Kerala
Thiruvananthapuram-695 039.**

Tel:0471 2335199, Fax: 0471 2330920

Email:sic@infokerala.org.in

Present:

Appeal No. 413/2007/SIC

File No.5118/SIC-G1/07

26.12.2007

Rekha B Menon
(Rep by POA Raveendran TP)
1071 A Stellite Township, Kakkanad
Kochi

} Appellant

1. Assistant Secretary and
Public Information Officer
Kerala State Housing Board
Santhi Nagar, Thiruvananthapuram.

2. Smt. Aleyamma Jose
Administrative Officer and
Public Information Officer
Kerala State Housing Board
Regional Office, Kochi.

} Respondent

ORDER

The Appellant approached the Commission with a second appeal on 14.07.2007. The facts leading to the petition are as follows:

The Appellant filed a request for information to the Respondent on 06.02.2007. It was recorded as received on 19.02.2007. It was sent to Regional Office, Ernakulam on 21.02.2007. It was received there on 22.02.2007. It was replied to on 17.03.2007. Of the six information asked for, replies were given for all except the fourth.

Dissatisfied with the reply, the Appellant filed the 1st appeal on 10.05.2007. As there was no reply to it, the 2nd appeal was filed.

On getting the 2nd appeal, the Commission called for a detailed report. In reply to that, the Respondent requested for time up to 30th September to furnish their report. And finally the report was submitted on 28.09.2007.

The Commission, after examining the report carefully, decided to summon the Appellant, both the PIOs of the Head Quarters as well as the Regional Office for a hearing. The hearing was held on 26.12.2007. Instead of the Appellant, the Power of Attorney holder Sri. T.P. Raveendran was present. All were heard.

The PIO of the Regional Office submitted that the answer to the fourth question could not be given in time, because the question was not clear. The effort to collect the information from other Regional Offices did not produce any positive results and finally clarification was sought from the holder of the Power of Attorney. Thus the answer to the fourth question was also furnished.

The Commission observed that the PIO at the Head Quarters, instead of collecting information from the Regional Office, should have straightaway sent the application to PIO of the Regional Office which was the custodian of the information. That would have saved time. Moreover, most of the information asked for appeared to be purely administrative in nature, which could not be considered under the RTI Act. However the information as available with the Public Authority is seen to have been furnished. No further intervention is, hence, called for.

The appeal is disposed of accordingly.

Dated this on 26th day of December 2007.

Authenticated Copy:

Secretary to Commission