





# ARUNACHAL PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION ITANAGAR

BEFORE THE HON'BLE COURT OF SHRI GUMJUM HAIDER, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER

No. APIC-75/2023

Dated, Itanagar the 2<sup>nd</sup> February'2024.

## Under Section 19(3) RTI Act, 2005

Appellant

#### Respondent

Shri Nabam Nanu & Shri Likha Tadap Rono Doimukh, PO/PS-Doimukh Papumpare District, AP

-V/S-

PIO-cum-DFO Sagalee Division Papumpare District, AP

### JUDGEMENT ORDER

This is an appeal under section 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005 was received from Shri Nabam Nanu & Shri Likha Tadap, Rono Doimukh, PO/PS-Doimukh, Papumpare District, Arunachal Pradesh, for non-furnishing of information, by the PIO–cum-DFO, Sagalee Division, Papumpare District, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh, as sought for by the appellant under section 6(1) of RTI Act, 2005.

Brief fact of the case being that the appellant on 28.09.2022 filed an RTI application under 'Form-A' before the PIO, whereby, seeking various information regarding:

"Village Reserve Forest (VRF) at Sagalee Division for the period 2011 to 2022 (till date)."

#### The above subject has been mentioned in detail under 'Form – A'.

The 1<sup>st</sup> hearing of this case was held on the 1<sup>st</sup> day of March'2023. Both the parties were present. After hearing both the parties, the Court directed the representative of the PIO to furnish the information as sought by the appellant on or before the next date of hearing of this case.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> hearing of this case held on the 26<sup>th</sup> day of April'2023. The appellant was present but the PIO was absent. During the hearing of this case, the appellant informed the Court that the information provided by the PIO were incomplete and misleading. The Court/Commission seriously viewed the absence of the PIO without any intimation and issued a Show Cause Notice to the PIO for his appearance on the next date of hearing of this case.

The  $3^{rd}$  hearing of this case was held on the  $24^{th}$  day of May'2023. Both the parties were absent. Hence, the case couldn't be heard.

The 4<sup>th</sup> hearing of this case held on the 7<sup>th</sup> day of June'2023. Both the parties were present. After hearing both the parties, the Court/Commission directed the PIO to re furnish the documents as sought by the appellant on or before the next date of hearing of this case.

The 5<sup>th</sup> hearing of this case was held on the 21<sup>st</sup> day of June'2023. Both the parties were present. After hearing both the parties, the Court/Commission directed the PIO to furnish an affidavit of the information not found in the PIO's office on or before the next date of hearing of this case.

The 6<sup>th</sup> hearing of this case held on the 5<sup>th</sup> day of July'2023. Both the parties were present. After hearing both the parties, the Court directed the appellant to provide the lists of left-out documents to the PIO and the same should be provided by the PIO on or before the next date of hearing of this case.

The 7<sup>th</sup> hearing of this case held on the 2<sup>nd</sup> August, 2023. Appellant was present and representative of the PIO, Shri T. Nobin, RFO-cum-APIO was also present. After hearing both the parties. The sworn in Affidavit and the left-out Information sought by the appellant had been provided by the representative of PIO during the court proceedings itself and handed over to the appellant. The appellant should go through the same and should inform his satisfaction/dissatisfaction on or before the next date of hearing of this case.

The 8<sup>th</sup> hearing of this case held on the 17<sup>th</sup> day of August'2023. Appellant was present and representative of the PIO, Shri T. Nobin, RFO-cum-APIO was also present. After hearing both the parties. All the documents have been resubmitted again and handed over to the appellant by the representative of the PIO during the court hearing itself. The appellant should go through the same and should inform his satisfaction/dissatisfaction on or before the next date of hearing of this case.

-2-

The 9<sup>th</sup> hearing of this case held on the 23<sup>rd</sup> August'2023, 2023. Appellant was present and representative of the PIO, Shri T. Nobin, RFO-cum-APIO was also present. After hearing both the parties. Appellant informed that the Sanction Order, UC and payment details were not provided by the PIO. The same should be provided by the PIO on or before the next date of hearing. The appellant should go through the same and should inform his satisfaction/dissatisfaction on or before the next date of hearing of this case.

The 10<sup>th</sup> hearing of this case held on the 13<sup>th</sup> September'2023. Appellant was present and representative of the PIO, Shri T. Nobin, RFO-cum-APIO was also present. After hearing both the parties. The left-out information as sought by the appellant was provided by the representative of the PIO. The appellant should go through the same and should inform his satisfaction/dissatisfaction on or before the next date of hearing of this case.

The 11<sup>th</sup> hearing of this case held on the 18<sup>th</sup> October'2023. Appellant was present but the PIO was absent. Therefore, the case couldn't be heard.

The 12<sup>th</sup> hearing of this case held on the 16<sup>th</sup> day of Nov'2023. The appellant was present but the PIO was absent. During the hearing of this case, the appellant informed the Court that the information provided by the PIO were incomplete and misleading. The Court/Commission seriously viewed the absence of the PIO without any intimation and issued a Show Cause Notice to the PIO for his appearance on the next date of hearing of this case.

The 13<sup>th</sup> hearing of this case was held on the 20<sup>th</sup> day of Dec'2023. The appellant was present but the PIO was absent. Hence, the case couldn't be heard.

The 14<sup>th</sup> hearing of this case was held on the 17<sup>th</sup> day of Jan'2024. Both the parties were present. After hearing both the parties, the court disposed of the case as there was no more information to be provided by the PIO. Also, an affidavit form had also been submitted by the PIO stating that there was no more information available in his custody. However, a liberty had been given to the appellant to file a fresh case in future if he felt some information are to be furnished to him by the PIO.

Considering all the above aspects into account, I find this appeal fit to be disposed of as infructuous. And, accordingly, this appeal stands disposed of and closed for once and for all. Each copy of this order disposing the appeal is furnished to the parties.

Given under my hand and seal of this Commission's Court on this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of February'2024.

Sd/-(GUMJUM HAIDER) State Information Commissioner, APIC, Itanagar.

Registrar/Dy. Registrar,

Arunachal FradsAPIC Itanagadimission

Memo.No.APIC- 75/2023/ / 3 20 Copy to: - Dated, Itanagar, the

February'2024.

- 1. The PIO-cum-DFO, Sagalee Division, Papumpare District, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh, pin-791114 for information and necessary action please.
- Shri Nabam Nanu & Shri Likha Tadap, Rono Doimukh, PO/PS-Doimukh, Papumpare District, Ph.8413096012/9362225892, Arunachal Pradesh, pin-791112 for information & necessary action please
- 3. The Computer Programmer/ Computer Operator for uploading on the Website of APIC, please.4. Office Copy.