



सूचना का
अधिकार
RIGHT TO
INFORMATION

ARUNACHAL PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION (APIC)
ITANAGAR

(Before the Hon'ble Information Commissioner Mr. Genom Tekseng)

AN APPEAL UNDER SECTION 19 (3) OF RTI ACT, 2005.

APIC-No.824/2022(Appeal)

Sh. Yukar Tai, Village Raga/Yada, Kamle
District, Arunachal Pradesh. (M)
9436251603, **Pin: 791120.**

Appellant

-Versus-

The PIO-Cum-EE, WRD, Raga Division,
Kamle District Arunachal Pradesh.
Pin: 791120.

Respondent

Date of hearing: 22.12.2023

Date of decision: 22.12.2023.

FACTS OF THE CASE:

This case was transferred to this commission by the SCIC vide order dated 25.05.2023 from the bench of Shri **Goto Ete , SIC.**

The appellant filed an RTI application dated **30.08.2022** seeking information on various works under **RE/BE, SIDF, SADA etc executed by the WRD, Raga Division.** The PIO did not furnish any reply to the RTI application. The appellant then filed a first Appeal dated **10.10.2022.** First Appellate Authority's (FAA) order, if any, is not available on record. Feeling aggrieved, the appellant approached the commission with the instant second Appeal.

After receipt of the second Appeal notices were issued to the parties to appear on **16.03.2023.**

The appellant appeared on 16.03.2023 and submitted that in inspite of the orders of the commission, the PIO did not furnish complete information. The appellant had further submitted that the PIO did not sign and affix his seal on the information provided to him. The PIO did not contest the submission of appellant. The commission after considering the facts and circumstances of the case observed that the PIO acted in violation of the provisions of the RTI Act 2005 and decided to initiate action against the PIO under section 20(1) of the said Act. Order to this effect was issued on 16.03.2023. The PIO was directed to appear on 20.04.2023 with his reply.

The PIO appeared on 20.04.2023 along with the information and sought the permission of the commission to hand over to the same to the appellant which was allowed. Accordingly, the appellant received the information. On the request of the appellant case was adjourned to 04.05.2023. The appellant appeared on 04.05.2023 and submitted that the information furnished by the PIO was far from satisfactory. The PIO was represented by **Shri Tarak Sima, AE.** PIO's representative did not make any submission on behalf of the PIO. However, the PIO was heard through

audio hearing. During the hearing the PIO agreed to make another effort to find the remaining information and furnish it to the appellant. The commission adjourned the hearing with direction to the PIO to furnish correct and complete information within 15 days from the issue of order.

Notices were again issued to the parties to appear on 22.12.2023.

DECISION:

None appears for the hearing scheduled today. However, the commission has received a letter dated 20.12.2023 from the appellant wherein he has stated he has received the information sought by him and expressed satisfaction regarding information furnished by him. Perusal of the said letter also reveals that the appellant received the information and showed satisfaction with the information provided. Keeping in view the facts of the case and the written submissions received from the appellant, the commission is of the opinion that complete information, though late, has been provided by the respondent PIO. The appellant has also showed satisfaction with the information provided. Hence, no further intervention of the commission is required in the matter and the action initiated against the PIO is dropped and the instant appeal stands **disposed of accordingly**.

Copy of the order be supplied to the parties

Sd/-

(Genom Tekseng)

Information Commissioner

Dated Itanagar the 22 January' 2024.

Memo No.APIC-824/2022/1239

Copy to:

1. ✓ Computer Programmer, Itanagar, APIC, to upload in APIC, website please.
2. Office copy.


Deputy Registrar
Registrar / Dy Registrar
Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission
APIC, Itanagar