



ITANAGAR, ARUNACHAL PRADESH

An appeal case U/S 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005

Vide Case No.APIC-553/2023

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE COURT OF SHRI VIJAY TARAM, THE STATE
INFORMATION COMMISSIONER, UNDER SECTION 19(3) OF RTI ACT, 2005.**

Shri Lokam Namdu

..... Appellant

-VERSUS-

PIO-Cum-Executive Engineer (PWD),
Sangram, Kurung Kumey District,
Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh

..... Respondent.

Order:30.09.2025.

JUDGEMENT

This is an appeal filed under sub-section (3) of Section 19 of the RTI 2005. Brief fact of the case is that the Appellant Shri Lokam Namdu on **28/03/2023** filed an RTI application in Form- 'A' before the PIO-cum-EE, PWD, Sangram Division, Kurung Kumey District, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh. Whereby seeking various information as quoted in his Form 'A' application. The Appellant being not receiving the information from the PIO filed the First Appeal before the First Appellate Authority (FAA) on **08/05/2023**. The Appellant not being receiving the required information even from the FAA, filed the second Appeal before the Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission (APIC) on **19/06/2023** and the Registry of the Commission having receipt of the Appeal registered it as **APIC- No- 553/2023 (Appeal)** and processed the same for its hearing and disposal.

Accordingly, matter came up for hearing before the Commission for six times. In the 6th hearing of the appeal on 30.09.2025, the Appellant is present during the hearing.

The PIO-cum-EE, PWD, Sangram Division, Kurung Kumey District, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh found absent during the hearing before the Commission.

Heard the Appellant;

The Appellant stated that he has failed the Application under the provisions of RTI, Act, 2005, but the PIO has not furnished him information.

After hearing the Appellant, the Commission hereby observes;

The PIO-cum-Executive Engineer, PWD, Sangram Division, Kurung Kumey District, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh, found absent during the hearing without intimating to the Commission, the reason for his inability to attend the hearing, which is unbecoming on the part of the PIO, who has to be reminded that, the PIO also has a mandatory duty to attend to statutory duties besides public duties, when an appeal is preferred against him/her.

On perusal of the Form-A application of the Appellant, it is seen that he has applied information for the long span of 10 (ten) years from 2013 to 2023 that too, he has asked the information(s) for all the schemes under the PIO-cum-Executive Engineer, PWD, Sangram Division, Kurung Kumey District, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh, the information for works undertaken under the scheme names: SADA/ADA/RIDF/RE/BE of entire Kurung Kumey District.

It is to be noted that a single scheme may have hundreds of work/project in a district thereby work/project under 6 (six) schemes may amount to hundreds or even thousands of small or big works to be executed, and the information(s) seeking for hundreds or even thousand of works starting from the sanction order, contractor details, Utilization Certificate (U/C), photographs and geo-tag copies, work order copies, Administrative approval, sanction order copies, work progress report copies, officers involved in work execution like EE/AE/JE, cheque receipt and PFMS copies, First and Final Bill, money receipt copies, advertisement of NIT in local newspaper copies, technical bid and price bid copies, site inspection report copies, trading license and proprietor name copies, Bank Guarantee Certificates, GST return file copies, firm registration certificate, and bank solvency certificate, contractor and department agreement copies, DPR copies, details of payment made to contractors with actual amount payment, photographs of completed work copies and Guidelines copies from 2013 to 23.03.2023. In the instant appeal the Appellant has filed application seeking information spanning over a decade and seeking information that is unclear and imprecise. A comprehensive review of the Form-A of the Appellant reveals that the information requested lack specificity, making it difficult for the PIO to provide the information(s).

The RTI, Act, 2005 has not been enacted for illogical application with intent to harassing the Public Information Officers (PIO) this laws has been including by thinking individual for as laws makers of the country to obtain information(s) wherever the public is in need of information in the Public interest but not to apply for information(s) of the details of all the works under a particular department or division, whereby to proceed and furnish such information(s) will run into thousands of pages is not tenable and such is not the agenda of the RTI, Act, 2005. It is not humanly to furnish such un-specified, illogical and vague information(s) to the vested interest, individual just to harass the PIO and to let the office of the PIO drift away from other public services just to provide information(s) for such vested interest, individuals seeking information by misusing the laws exhaustibly. The cumulative burden of dealing with vague and illogical requests for information has imposed an unnecessary strain on public resources and the other warranted functions of the PIO.

Under section 6 of the RTI, Act, 2005, an applicant is obliged to make a request in a manner that is specific and clear to facilitate the processing of the request. The act necessitates that requests for information must be articulated in a manner that enables the PIO to respond appropriately.

The application for vague, illogical and requests over ten years of information represents a failure to adhere to the standards set forth in the RTI, Act and such practices are not only detrimental to the individual's intent of obtaining information but also disrupt the efficient functioning of public information systems.

Under the above stated facts and circumstances the Commission is of the wise opinion that the Form-A of the Appellant is filed for seeking illogical information(s) and by the above observations, with no specific cause of action, the Commission hereby dismiss and close this appeal.

Order;

In view of the above facts and circumstance the Commission dismiss this Appeal with prejudice due to the Appellants failure to adhere to the requirements of specificity and clarity mandated by the Right to Information Act, 2005. The Appellant is advised to formulate any future requests for information in a precise and logical manner to facilitate a productive process. And, accordingly, this Appeal stands dismissed and closed once for all.

Judgment pronounced in the open Court of this Commission today on this 30th day of September' 2025.

Given under my hand and seal of this Commission/Court on this 30th day of September' 2025.

Sd/-
(Vijay Taram)
State Information Commissioner
APIC-Itanagar

Memo.No.APIC-553/A/2023/921 Dated Itanagar, the 08th October, 2025.
Copy to:

1. PIO-Cum-Executive Engineer, PWD, Sangram, K/Kumey District, Govt of Arunachal Pradesh for information and necessary action please. **Pin Code-791118.**
2. Shri Lokam Namdu, Kankar Nallah, PO/PS-Naharlagun, P/Pare District Arunachal Pradesh for information please. **Contact No. 9362166831**
3. The Computer Programmer, APIC for uploading on the Website of APIC please.
4. Office Copy


Registrar/Dy. Registrar
APIC, Itanagar.

Deputy Registrar
Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission
Itanagar