

The Right to Information Commission

RTIC Appeal No: 679/2022

N.A. Jayawickrama
30,
Skelton Road,
Colombo 05

-Appellant-

Vs.

**Sri Lanka Land Reclamation &
Development Corporation
(SLRDC)**
3, Sri Jayawardhenapura Mawatha,
Welikala

-Public Authority-

Before : 1. Justice Upaly Abeyrathne (Rtd.) - Chairman
2. Justice Rohini Walgama (Rtd.) - Commissioner
3. Mr. Jagath Liyana Arachchi (Attorney-at-Law) - Commissioner
4. Mr. Mohamed Nahiya (D.G - Rehab. – Rtd.) - Commissioner

Appearance : The Appellant participated via T.P No. 077 7654373

The Public Authority represented by K. Nishanthi, Enforcement Officer / Information Officer, W.H Keerthirathne, Deputy General Manager, (A&D), S.N Gamage, Addl. General Manager, (A&D) and R. Sampath, Actg. Chief Engineer

Written Submission: The Appellant on : Not submitted
The Public Authority on : Not submitted

Date of Hearing : 20.10.2022

Decided on : 20.10.2022

Decision of the Commission:

Brief Factual Background:

The Appellant by information requests dated 19.11.2021 requested for the following information.

1. *“A certified copy of “The Site Inspection and Study Report for Flooding Issues in Mosque Lane, Kurunduwatte, Rajagiriya” dated February 2021 by the SLRDC.*
2. *The names and designations of the SLRDC officers who prepared the aforesaid report. (to be provided in English)*
3. *A list of the names and addresses of the flood-affected parties mentioned in page 1 of the aforesaid report.*
4. *Who are the general public who has complained of the flooding named in page 1 of the aforesaid report, please provided a list of names and addresses of the general public named in page 1 of the aforesaid report.*
5. *In page 1 of the aforesaid report mentions that at a site inspection on 13/01/2021 State holder organizations participated. Please clarify what is meant by “State Holder Organizations” and provide a list of these organizations.*
6. *In page 1 of the aforesaid report is it meant to be “State Holder Organizations” or Stake Holder Organizations”. Kindly clarify and provide a list of these organizations.*
7. *In page 1 of the aforesaid report mentions that on 18/1/2021 SLRDC officers carried out a site inspection with the flood affected parties, please provide the names and designations of the SLRDC officers who carried out a site inspection and a list of the names and addresses of the purported flood affected parties whose premises were inspected.*
8. *In page 2 of the aforesaid report mentions “The general public” please define the term the general public”.*
9. *In page 3 of the aforesaid report it mentions that land acquisition be minimized however in page 7 of the aforesaid report it mentions to create a “Proposed wetland” by acquiring 3 acres of land. Please clarify the inconsistency in the report. (to be provided in English)*
10. *A certified copy of the petition of the residents claiming flooding which has been provided to you.”*

The Information Officer (IO) on 30.12.2021 responded as follows;

“..... The information is still being prepared. The pandemic effect on the Corporation’s workforce has caused a delay in document provision. We will notify you soon as we have made a decision on your request.”

Dissatisfied with the response of the Information Officer the Appellant lodged an appeal with the Designated Officer on 06.12.2021. As the Designated Officer failed to respond within the time period stipulated under the Act the Appellant preferred this appeal to the Commission on 15.03.2022.

Consideration:

During the pendency of this appeal inquiry, the Public Authority has taken steps to provide information to the Appellant by their letter dated 12.10.2022. The Appellant admitted the same and informed that he is satisfied with the said response. Accordingly, this appeal is concluded.

The Director General is directed to convey the Order to the Appellant, the Information Officer and the Public Authority.

Appeal concluded.