



ITANAGAR, ARUNACHAL PRADESH

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

Vide Case No.APIC-448/2026

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

Shri Tam Rararu

..... Appellant

-VERSUS-

PIO-Cum-General Manager, State Transport Services,
Naharlagun, Papum Pare District,
Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh

..... Respondent.

Order: 17.09.2026.

JUDGMENT FOR DISMISSING THE APPEAL

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 Tam Rararu on **16/04/2026** filed an RTI application in Form- 'A' before the PIO-cum-General Manager, State Transport Services, Naharlagun, Papumpare District, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh. Whereby seeking various information as quoted in Form 'A' application. The Appellant receiving the in-complete information from the PIO filed the First Appeal before the First Appellate Authority (FAA) on **18/05/2026**, and even then, the Appellant not receiving the required information from the PIO, filed the Second Appeal before the Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission on **22/06/2026** and the Registry of the Commission (APIC) having receipt of the Appeal registered it as APIC-No. **448/A/2026** (Appeal) and processed the same for its hearing and disposal.

Accordingly, matter come up for hearing today on **17.09.2026**, wherein, both the parties are present during the hearing before the Commission.

Heard the Appellant;

The Appellant stated that the PIO has provided him information pertaining to 2024 to 2026, but he is not satisfied with the information as provided by the PIO because he feels that some of the information(s) are in-complete.

Heard the PIO;

The PIO stated that on receipt of the Form-A submitted by the Appellant on 20.04.2026 and on the same day the PIO sent the Form-A to his concerned branch to furnish the information within stipulated time of 30 days. On 18.05.2026 the Appellant visited the office of the PIO to enquire about the information while two days was still remaining for the PIO to furnish the information to the Appellant. The PIO furnished the complete information on 21.05.2026.

After that the Appellant again submitted a letter to the office of the PIO citing that he is not satisfied with the information that have been provided to him for which the PIO on 10.06.2026 wrote a letter to the Appellant Shri Tam Rararu asking him to pin point as to what information(s) are in-complete and which of the information(s) are not satisfying to him.

But unfortunately the Appellant has not written back and has not replied the letter of dated 10.06.2026 till now. And therefore, the office of the PIO is not able to decide as to what information(s) are in-complete and for what reason the Appellant is dissatisfied, but the fact remains that complete information have been provided to the Appellant on 21.05.2026 which the Appellant had received personally from the office of the PIO and there is no other information left to be furnished to the Appellant.

After hearing both the parties the Commission hereby observes;

- i) That the PIO has provided the complete information to the Appellant on 21.05.2026 within stipulated time provided under RTI, Act, 2005 and after receiving the letter from the Appellant citing dissatisfaction about the information, the PIO has again written to the Appellant on 10.06.2026 to mention as to what information are remaining to be provided to him and for what reason he is not satisfied with the information provided by the PIO.
- ii) The Appellant has not bothered to reply back to the PIO and the claim of the Appellant in not receiving the complete information and not satisfied with the information cannot be considered now.

Under the above observations the Commission hereby opine that in this instant appeal the PIO has done his part in supplying the complete information to the Appellant within time and upon a letter of dissatisfaction from the Appellant written back to the PIO, the PIO yet again wrote back to the Appellant to mention particularly as to what information are not provided to him, but the non responsive nature and attitude from the Appellant has made the PIO simply confused as to what information might have been left out because the PIO has already furnished all the information(s) i.e available with him pertaining to the Form-A submitted by the Appellant and under all the observations above and going through the exhibits as exhibited by the PIO, the Commission hereby dismiss this appeal by taking into consideration all the statements submitted by the Appellant as well as the PIO, and therefore, this appeal is dismissed and closed once for all.

In view of the above facts and circumstances the Commission dismiss this Appeal. And, accordingly, this Appeal stands dismissed and closed once for all.

Judgment pronounced in the open Court of this Commission today on this 17th day of September' 2026.

Given under my hand and seal of this Commission on this 17th day of September' 2026.

Sd/-

(Vijay Taram)


State Information Commissioner
APIC-Itanagar

Memo.No.APIC-448/A/2026 /111

Dated Itanagar, the 21st September, 2026.

Copy to:

1. PIO-Cum-General Manager, State Transport Services, Naharlagun, P/Pare District, Govt of Arunachal Pradesh for information and necessary action please. **Pin Code:791110**
2. Shri Tam Rararu, Nyorch, Yupia, P/Pare District, Arunachal Pradesh for information please. **Contact No. 8415937464**
3. The Computer Programmer, APIC for uploading on the Website of APIC and mail it to the concerned department please.
4. Office Copy


Registrar/Dy. Registrar
APIC, Itanagar.

Deputy Registrar
Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission
Itanagar