



The State Information Commission, Kerala
Punnen Road, Thiruvananthapuram-695 039.

Tel:0471 2335199, Fax:0471 2330920
Email: sic@infokerala.org.in

Complaint No.283/2007/SIC

Shri.Ravikrishnan.N.R,
Advocate, House No.101,
N.S.P.Nagar, Kesavadaspuram,
Thiruvananthapuram-695 004.



Petitioner

Vs

Public Information Officer
Family Court,
Nedumangad.



Respondent

ORDER

The petitioner in this case is one Mr.Ravikrishnan.N.R. He is an Advocate practicing at Nedumangad mainly in the Family Court. Ext A1 is the request preferred by the petitioner Advocate on 24.3.2007. Five questions were asked. For a clear understanding of the same Ext A1 is reproduced below;

"a) O.P.1277/05-mw \¼Ä tIknÄ 23.12.2006pÄ FXrIfn

l.A2982/06pmw \¼Äcmbn t_m[n,n" CwPKvj³ lÄPnbpsS

HdnPn\Ä FhnsSbmWv?

b) O.P.360/05-mw \¼Ä tIkv hn[n]dbp¶Xn\mbn amänbn«pÄXv

hn[nht¶m? F|nÄ F¶p hn[n]mÊm;n?

c) O.P.389/05, O.P.374/05 F¶o tIkpIÄ IfnIÄ]dªv cmPnbmbn. F¶mÂ compromise tIävsaäv FSpip¶Xn\mbn t]mÏv sNbvXn«nÃ. Sn tIkpIÄ FhnsS? AsX¶v t]mÏv sN¿pw?

d)]pXnbXmbn ^bÂ sN¿p¶ tIÊpifnÂ IfnItfmsv I«nbpÅ docket hm§n h¶mÂ am{Xta ^benÂ FSpiq F¶v inckvXZmÂ Bhiys,Sp¶p. AXv GXv 'N«w' A\pkcn"mWv?

e) tIcf tImÄ«v ^okv kyq«v hmÃyptthj³ \nba {]Imcw courtfee bpw lÂPn ^okpwHgnhm;nb«pÅ lÂPnIÄ ^bÂ sN¿pt½mgpw IfnIfnÂ \n¶pw \nÂ_Ôambn ^okv CuSmip¶Xv GXv \nbaw A\pkcn"mWv?

The complaint was filed on the grounds that the information furnished were incorrect and incomplete. There was also an allegation that the answers given were false and also misleading. There was an imputation of corruption against the Public Information Officer like demanding additional sheets (papers) and court fee stamps.

The petitioner was heard on 12.9.2007 on which date the Public Information Officer had made a request to excuse his absence. Today when the case was taken up for hearing Shri.K.Sathyam, U.D.Clerk (Higher Grade) and Public Information Officer, Family Court, Nedumangad was present and preferred an affidavit and had already filed a detailed report.

The question that arises for consideration are whether the information required were furnished and whether the answers given were adequate enough to satisfy the requester?

From the very outset it could be seen that the queries and questions were pertaining to a particular case OP.360/05 pending trial before the Family

Court. The first question was with regard to the posting of an IA application 2982/2006. The answers given would suggest that the same IA application was pending along with the case. The second question was with regard to pronouncement of judgment in the original petition 360/05. The Public Information Officer had answered that the same matter was pending for judgment with the Judge. In all other questions also the Public Information Officer had given reasonable answers.

Unlike other departments, the Public Information Officer in the Administrative side of a Court of Law is highly restricted with certain Rules and Regulations. If the matter is pending with the Judge for judgment, the Public Information Officer cannot exercise his powers to get back the file and cannot interfere with the judgment and the procedural formalities of posting, hearing and pronouncement of orders. Regarding other allegations of demanding extra and excess court fee stamps and insisting for filing case records in a bonded form *etc.*, the Public Information Officer had denied such allegations.

On a perusal of the report and Ext A2, the reply furnished by the Public Information Officer, the Commission is satisfied that the Public Information Officer had diligently replied the questions within the stipulated time and date and there was no further reasons to proceed. In the light of this affidavit and remarks, the petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by the Commission on this, the 8th day of October, 2007.

Sd/-

Authenticated copy

Secretary to Commission

