



**ARUNACHAL PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION, (APIC)**  
**ITANAGAR, ARUNACHAL PRADESH**

An apple case U/S 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005  
Vide Case No.APIC- 342/A/2025

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

Shri Riya Taram, Bengia Tahar & Lokam Namdu.....**Appellant.**

**-VERSUS-**

PIO-cum-EE (WRD), Seppa Division ..... **Respondent.**  
East Kameng District.

Date of hearing : 03/09/2025  
Date of decision/Judgment : 03/09/2025

INFORMATION COMMISSIONER : Shri Khopey Thaley  
Relevant facts emerging from Appeal:

RTI application file on : 22/02/2025  
PIO replied on :  
First appeal file on : 24/03/2025  
First Appellate Authority's order :  
2<sup>nd</sup> Appeal dated : 28/04/2025

**Information sought :**

The appellant file an RTI Application dated 22/02/2025 seeking Details regarding furnish all the relevant information against the implementation and development works under the funding head of Budget Estimate (BE) rom 2020-2025.

As per the case record, PIO has never conducted hearing under his jurisdiction.

Being dissatisfied, the appellant filed First Appeal dated 24/03/2025. No hearing has been conducted by the First Appellate in this regard. Feeling aggrieved and dissatisfied, appellant approached the Commission with instant Second Appeal.

**The following were present.**

Appellant : Shri Riya Taram, Bengia Tahar & Lokam Namdu absent.  
Respondent : PIO-cum-EE (WRD), Seppa Division is represented by the APIO through VC.

**JUDGMENT/ORDER**

This is an appeal filed under sub-section (3) of Section 19 of the RTI Act, 2005. Brief fact of the case is that the appellants Shri Riya Taram, Bengia Tahar & Lokam Namdu on **22.02.2025** filed an RTI application under Form-'A' before the PIO-Cum- Executive Engineer (WRD), Seppa Division, East Kameng District, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh

whereby, seeking various information, as quoted in Form-A application. The Appellant, being not satisfied with the information received from the PIO, filed the First Appeal before the First Appellate Authority on **24.03.2025**, Appellant, again having not received the required information from the FAA, filed the Second Appeal before the Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission on **28.04.2025** and the Registry of the Commission (APIC), having receipt of the appeal, registered it as **APIC No. 342/A/2025** and processed the same for its hearing and disposal.

Accordingly, matter came up for hearing before the Commission for first time i.e on 03/09/2025. In this hearing of the appeal on 3<sup>rd</sup> day of September, 2025, PIO-cum-EE (WRD), Seppa Division is represented by the APIO through VC but the appellant Shri Riya Taram, Bengia Tahar & Lokam Namdu found absent without any intimation to the Commission. The appellant is directed to file before the F.A.A for the information under Section 6 of RTI Act which he is seeking. The FAA-cum-Chief Engineer (PHE & WS), Western Zone, Itanagar, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh, Itanagar and PIO-cum-Executive Engineer (WRD), Seppa Division, East Kameng District, is directed to take up case and dispose as per Section-7 of RTI Act, 2005 within 30 days on receipt of the request.

Under Section 19(1) of the Act, the First Appellate Authority (FAA), the intermediate level, has to adjudicate on the Appeal, if any, filed by the information seekers against the decision of the PIO.

As laid down at para-38 of the Guidelines for the FAA issued by the GOI and the State Govt., adjudication on the appeals under the RTI Act is a quasi-judicial function. It is, therefore, necessary that the Appellate Authority should see to it that the justice is not only done but it should also appear to have been done. In order to do so, the order passed by the appellate authority should be a speaking order giving justification for the decision arrived at.

The First Appellate Authority (FAA), following the principle of natural justice, should conduct hearing giving fair and equal opportunity to both the appellant and the PIO and thereafter must pass reasoned and speaking order on merit within 30 days from the date of receipt of the appeal or else the action of the FAA would be considered as procedural lapse on the part of the FAA.

Further, it is noticed that the Appellant in most case do not wait for the orders of the First Appellate Authority (FAA) and directly prefer appeals before the 2<sup>nd</sup> Appellate Authority without attaching a copy of order passed by the First Appellate Authority (FAA) unintelligently. Here, it is germane to note that for availing 2<sup>nd</sup> appeal before the 2<sup>nd</sup> Appellate Authority, the Appellant has been given 90 days' time from the date of order passed by the First Appellate Authority (FAA). The 2<sup>nd</sup> appeal, if he/she is dissatisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority (FAA), must be accompanied by the orders passed by the First Appellate Authority (FAA).

The appeal is accordingly remand back to the First Appellate Authority for adjudication and passing an appropriate order who, being the officer senior in rank to the PIO and well versed with the knowledge of the functioning of the department, shall apply his mind and go into the aspects like what kind of information was sought by appellant in his application, whether the same could be provided or whether the same is exempted under the relevant provisions of section 8 of the Act or whether the information relates to matter



covered by Section 11 of the RTI Act etc. and then pass a speaking order giving justification for his decision within 3 (three) weeks from the date of receipt of this order.

Therefore, perusing the case records, the Commission deemed fit to remand back the appeal case APIC No. 342/2025 to First Appellate Authority for proper hearing. The case is disposed off with liberty to appellant to prefer second appeal if dissatisfied or aggrieved by the decision of the First Appellate Authority for which no fees need be paid.

The Commission found that the hearing case has not been done through proper procedure, I find this appeal fit to be disposed of and closed. And, accordingly, this appeal stands disposed off and remand back to FAA for proper hearing.

Judgment/Order pronounced in the open Court of this Commission today on this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of September, 2025. Each copy of Judgment/Order be furnished to the parties.

Given under my hand and seal of this Commission/Court on this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of September, 2025.


Sd/-  
(Khohey Thaley)  
State Information Commissioner  
APIC, Itanagar.

Memo.No.APIC-342/A/2025

Dated Itanagar, the ...<sup>5</sup>... Sept' 2025.

Copy to:

1. The FAA-cum-Chief Engineer (PHE & WS), Western Zone, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh, Itanagar for information and necessary action please.
2. The PIO-cum-Executive Engineer (WRD), Seppa Division, East Kameng District, Arunachal Pradesh for information and necessary action please. Pin code.790102
3. Shri Riya Taram, Bengia Tahar & Lokam Namdu, C/o Rieng Store, Near Catholic Church, Jollang, Arunachal Pradesh for information & necessary action. **Contact No. 9383103387/9402443699**
4. The Computer Programmer for upload on the Website of APIC, please.
5. Office Copy.

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