



ITANAGAR, ARUNACHAL PRADESH

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

Vide Case No.APIC-526/2025

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

Shri Bachunum Yun

..... **Appellant**

-VERSUS-

PIO-Cum-Block Development Officer,
Chaglagam Block, Anjaw District,
Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh

..... **Respondent.**

Order: 26.05.2026.

JUDGEMENT

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 Bachunum Yun on **18/01/2025** filed an RTI application in Form- 'A' before the PIO-cum-BDO-CD, Block, Chaglagam, Anjaw District, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh. Whereby seeking various information as quoted in Form 'A' application. The Appellant not receiving the information from the PIO filed the First Appeal before the First Appellate Authority (FAA) on **20/03/2025**, and even then, the Appellant not receiving the required information from the PIO, filed the Second Appeal before the Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission (APIC) on **07/05/2025** and the Registry of the Commission (APIC) having receipt of the Appeal registered it as APIC-No. **526/A/2025** (Appeal) and processed the same for its hearing and disposal.

Accordingly, matter came up for hearing before the Commission on **26.05.2026**, wherein both the parties are present during the hearing before the Commission.

1. Heard the Appellant;

The Appellant stated that the PIO has not provided him the information till today.

On cross-checking the information sought by the Appellant and discussing on the type of information whether the information are bonafide information to be furnished or are exempted information, the Appellant without reason, started hurling abusive language towards the presiding officer/Commission and even alleged being biased towards the side of the PIO.

2. Conduct of Appellant during Proceedings:

Upon the commencement of the hearing, the Appellant, Shri Bachunum Yun, exhibited highly unbecoming and contumacious behavior. Instead of addressing the merits of the case or the deficiencies in the information provided, the Appellant resorted to shouting at the Presiding Information Commissioner and using offensive language against the Respondent.

3. Allegations of Bias:

Furthermore, the Appellant levelled grave, unsubstantiated, and scurrilous allegations against this Commission. The Appellant explicitly accused the presiding Information Commissioner of being "biased" and "hand-in-glove" with the Respondent/Public Information Officer, without providing a shred of evidence or logic to support such a claim. Despite several warnings from the Presiding Officer to maintain the decorum of the quasi-judicial proceedings and to argue the case on its merits, the Appellant continued to obstruct the proceedings and persisted in his aggressive demeanor.

4. Observations of the Commission:

The RTI Act, 2005, is a tool for transparency and accountability; it is not a license for a litigant to bully, intimidate, or malign the integrity of a quasi-judicial forum. While the Commission ensures that the principles of natural justice are upheld, it cannot be a silent spectator to the abuse of the process of law.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court and various High Courts have repeatedly held that no litigant has the right to cast aspersions on the Bench/Commission simply because they anticipate an unfavorable order or seek to exert pressure on the presiding officer. Such "bench-hunting" or "arm-twisting" tactics are a direct assault on the independence of the Commission.

5. Decision:

In view of the Appellant's persistent rude behavior, his refusal to follow the rules of the court, and the baseless accusations of bias intended to bring the Commission into disrepute, this Commission finds that the Appellant is not interested in a constructive hearing on the merits of the RTI application and his second appeal.

The Commission refuses to hear the Appellant further under these circumstances. Allowing the hearing to continue in such a hostile atmosphere would be a travesty of justice and would set a precedent for the harassment of public officials and judicial officers.

As a result:

- i) The hearing is hereby terminated and the appeal is dismissed for abuse of the process of law.
- ii) The Appellant is warned to maintain proper conduct and decorum in all future interactions with the Commission.
- iii) A copy of this order shall be placed in the Appellant's permanent file for future reference in any subsequent appeals/complaints filed by him.

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 26th day of May' 2026.

Given under my hand and seal of this Commission on this 26th day of May' 2026.

Sd/-

(Vijay Taram)


State Information Commissioner
APIC-Itanagar

Memo.No.APIC-526/A/2025/1295

Dated Itanagar, the 26th May, 2026.

Copy to:

1. PIO-Cum-BDO, Chaglaganm, Anjaw District, Govt of Arunachal Pradesh for information and necessary action please. **Pin Code:792104**
2. Shri Bachunum Yun, Rock Land Tezu, Lohit District Arunachal Pradesh for information please. **Contact No. 8729838414**
3. The Computer Programmer, APIC for uploading on the Website of APIC please.
4. Office Copy


Registrar/Dy. Registrar
APIC, Itanagar.

Deputy Registrar
Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission
Manager