



ARUNACHAL PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION
ITANAGAR.

An Appeal Case U/S 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005

Case No. APIC- 628/2025.

APPELLANT : Shri Nechang Kamki, Niti Vihar, Itanagar.

RESPONDENT : The PIO, o/o the Divisional Forest Officer, Aalo, West Siang Distt.

ORDER

This is an appeal under Section 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005 received from Shri Nechang Kamki for non-furnishing of below mentioned information by the PIO, o/o the Divisional Forest Officer, Aalo West Siang District Arunachal Pradesh as sought for by him under section 6(1) (Form-A) of RTI Act, 2005 vide his application dated 21.04.2025.

C) Particulars of Information: Green India Mission (GIM) in the financial years of 2021-2024

D) Details of information required:

1. Furnish a copy of Sanction order;
2. Furnish a copy of the list of work executed from your Division pertaining to the Green India Mission Scheme;
3. Furnish a copy of the list of the contractors with work order pertaining to the Green India Mission Scheme;
4. Furnish a copy of the details of MIS report;
5. Furnish a copy of the details of Geo tag-Tagging in coloring;
6. Furnish a copy of the details project report (DPR);
7. Furnish a copy of the list of the species plant (fuel-wood, fodder, NTFPs, Artisanal raw materials, timber yielding species and many indigenous species etc.) planted or carried out against the above mentioned scheme;
8. Furnish a copy of the total number of seeding raises from nurseries with procurement of challan details;
9. Furnish a copy of GST return 3B field of all the supplied/ contractors before releasing payment;
10. Furnish a copy of the details of notice Inviting Tender (NIT) details with newspaper cutting;
11. Furnish a copy of the name of the bidder with detail supporting document of the same;
12. Furnish a copy of the name of the all the participants with detail document;
13. Furnish a copy of the detail of the Bank Guarantee from which National Bank has been submitted by the contractor;
14. Furnish a copy of the detail on the ground for rejection of the technical bids of all bidders who were disqualified in the evaluation process. This should include specific deficiencies or no-compliance with the tender requirement;
15. Furnish a copy of the contractor licenses of the selected bidder, including the date of registration and any relevant updates or renewals;
16. Furnish a copy of the completion certificate;
17. of the Utilization Certificate;
18. Furnish a copy of the MIS report in coloring;
19. Furnish a copy of the documents in proper paging with CTC in each page.

Brief facts emerging from the appeal and the decision :

Records emerging from the appeal disclose that the appellant, Shri Nechang Kamki had requested the PIO for the aforementioned information / documents in response to which the PIO, Shri Gobin Padu, vide his letter dt. 21st May, 2025, intimated the appellant to remit a sum of Rs. 5,174 (Rupees five thousand one hundred seventy four) being the cost of documents and collect the documents from his office. The appellant, however, objected to the cost of documents demanded by the PIO and after controverting the number of pages and the rates of documents, he remitted a sum of Rs.1124.00 through online Treasury Challan dt.09.08.2025 being the cost of 562 pages of documents @ Rs.2.00 per page as prescribed under relevant rules. Records however, reveal that the PIO did not provide the requested information/documents sticking to his contention that the appellant deposit the cost of documents (Rs.5174/-) as demanded vide his various correspondences.

The information as sought for by the appellant, thus, remained unfurnished even after approaching the FAA, the CCF, Central Circle, Pasighat, who dismissed the appeal on the ground that the objections raised by the appellant regarding the number of pages of documents and the cost thereof is not a valid reason for filing 2nd appeal.

Hence, this 2nd appeal before this Commission under Section 19 (3) of the RTI Act, 2005 vide Memo of Appeal dt. 18.08.2025 .

This appeal was, accordingly, heard on 22nd Oct., 2025 wherein the appellant, Shri Nechang Kamki was represented by his Counsel, Advocate Shri Dope Ori in person and the PIO, Shri Gopin Padu attended through VC.

The PIO reiterating the contents of his letter dt. 21st May, 2025 by which the appellant was advised to collect the documents from his office by depositing a sum of Rs. 5,174/- (Rupees five thousand one hundred seventy four) being the cost of documents, submitted that the requested documents are ready to be furnished to the appellant provided the appellant deposit the cost of the documents as demanded by his office. The PIO also displayed the colour photographs of the GEO Tag printed on legal size FS paper, the cost for which, he claimed, to be Rs.20.00 per page. On the other hand, the Ld. Counsel for the appellant contended that the appellant had remitted the cost of documents correctly as per the prescribed rates although the PIO ought to have provided the documents/information free of cost in terms of section 7(6) as the PIO failed to respond to his RTI application within the prescribed period of 30 days. The Ld. Counsel also contended that the appellant had requested for the documents in an A4 size FS paper not in legal size FS paper. He, therefore, pleaded for an appropriate direction to the PIO to provide the requested information for which he had remitted the aforesaid sum of Rs. 1124.00.

This Commission, upon hearing the parties and considering the cherished rights of the information seeker under the RTI Act and considering the fact that the requested information/documents are not exempted from disclosure under the RTI Act and are, admittedly, available and ready to be furnished, the PIO was directed to furnish the same to the appellant who was also directed to visit the o/o the PIO and collect the same and intimate this Commission by 15th November, 2025 for further consideration of the appeal failing which making it was made clear that the this appeal shall stand closed without further notice.

This Commission notices now, after the expiry of the dateline i.e 15.11.2025, that the PIO, vide letter dt. 15.11.2025 (copy received in this Commission on 24.11.2025), informed that the appellant did not collect the information which was kept ready.

In the premises as above, this Commission concludes that the appellant is no longer interested in the requested information and therefore, this appeal stands disposed of and closed in terms of the stipulation contained in this Commission's order dt.22.10.2025.


Given under my hand and seal of this Commission on this 25th Nov., 2025.

Sd/-
(S.TSERING BAPPU)
State Information Commissioner,
APIC, Itanagar.

Memo No. APIC-628/2025 /a92 **Dated Itanagar, the 28 Nov., 2025**

Copy to: -

1. The Chief Conservator of Forest Central Arunachal Circle, Pasighat, First Appellate Authority (FAA) PIN: 791102 for information.
2. The PIO, o/o the PIO, o/o the Divisional Forest Officer, Aalo West Siang District PIN: 791001 for information.
3. Shri Nechang Kamki, Niti Vihar, PO/PS- Itanagar, Papum Pare District (A.P) (Contact No. 9436872228) for information.
- ✓ 4. The Computer Programmer/Computer Operator for uploading on the website of APIC, please.
5. Office Copy.
6. S/Copy.


Registrar/ Deputy Registrar
APIC, Itanagar.

Deputy Registrar
Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission
Itanagar