

DESPATCHED
On.. 08/06/2020



STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION, KERALA
PUNNEN ROAD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695 001
Tel: 0471 2561600, 2561613, 2561614, 2561615 Fax: 0471 2330920

Email: sic.ker@nic.in

Proceedings of the Appeal Petition No.1334(6)/2015/SIC
(File No.8522/SIC-Gen5/2015)

PRESENT

Vinson M. Paul, Chief Information Commissioner

Sri. K.K.Mathew,
House No. XVI/346,
Karimpanackal,
M.C. Road, Chengannur,
Kottayam – 689 121.

} Appellant

1) The State Public Information Officer &
Deputy Tahasildar (HQ),
Taluk Office, Chengannur,
Kottayam.

2) Appellate Authority & Tahasildar,
Taluk Office, Chengannur,
Kottayam.

} Respondents

Date of application u/s 6(1)	02/01/2015
Date of reply furnished	22/01/2015
Date of 1 st appeal	18/02/2015
Date of decision on the 1 st appeal	16/03/2015
Date of filing 2 nd appeal	20/05/2015
Date of receipt of 2 nd appeal in the Commission	21/05/2015

ORDER

Appeal Petitioner Sri. K.K.Mathew, stated that the information furnished by the Respondents were not satisfactory.

2. In his application submitted before the 1st Respondent, the Appellant stated that he was enclosing form No.7 in connection with processing of the PV on 17/6/2011 by the Additional Tahasildar, Chengannur. In connection with the above, he sought the following information:

- i. At the time of the PV processing, whether the property was measured. If so, furnish the measurement details.
- ii. In the remarks column, the document number and survey sub division number are not recorded. He requested for furnishing the reason for not recording the above.
- iii. Without giving the above details whether the processing of PV is correct and so on numbering to 5 items.

Reply to the above application was furnished by the 1st Respondent stating that the property in question was not measured for processing the pokkuvaravu. With regard to item 2, it was stated that the document number and survey sub division number are not recorded in form 7 as the copy of the document was incorporated in the file. With regard to item 3, it was stated that nothing was wrong in processing of the PV in question. With regard to items 4 & 5 , it was stated that there was no lapse of the part of the Additional Tahasildar.

3. The Appellant filed his first appeal before the 2nd Respondent stating that he was not satisfied with the reply furnished by the 1st Respondent. He requested the 2nd Respondent to furnish reply with respect to form 7 enclosed along with his application. The above appeal was disposed of by the 2nd Respondent stating that the Appellant could peruse the file concerned during any working day.


4. On scrutinizing the appeal petition and connected documents, the Commission finds that the 1st Respondent had furnished information sought by the Appellant. The Appellant in items 2, 3, 4 & 5 sought information which are not available in the office of the Respondent. In those items, the Appellant sought clarifications/opinions instead of information as available in any of the files/registers maintained by the Respondent office. In view of the above, the Commission does not find any lapse of the part of the Respondents and hence dismisses this appeal petition on the 11th day of May, 2020.

Sd/-

Vinson M. Paul

Chief Information Commissioner

Authenticated Copy



Additional Secretary(law)



