





ARUNACHAL PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION ITANAGAR

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

No.APIC-407/2021

Dated, Itanagar the 28th November', 2023.

Under Section 19(3) RTI Act, 2005

VS

Appellant

Shri Mamu Sono, Vill -Sood

PO/PS- Naharlagun,

Naharlagun, ICR, AP.

Respondent

PIO-cum- EE, WRD Division,

Namsai Division, District - Namsai.

JUDGEMENT ORDER

An appeal under section 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005 was received from Shri Mamu Sono, Vill – Sood, PO/PS - Naharlagun, ICR, Arunachal Pradesh, for non-furnishing of information, by The PIO-cum-Executive Engineer, Water Resource Division, Namsai Division, District – Namsai, 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 11.10.2021 filed an RTI application under 'Form-A' before the PIO, whereby, seeking various information regarding:

"Regarding furnish the details of Firms Registration against M/S Gaurav Career & Enterprise and M/S A.K Enterprise which has awarded for construction of 'flood protection at New Silatoo and Deo-Beel Namsai' under WR Sub-Division :: Namsai (RIDF scheme 2016-2017)."

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

The 1st hearing for the case was held on 09th day of March' 2022. The appellant was present but the PIO was absent. Adv. M. Pertin represented the case on-behalf of the PIO. Heard both the parties. The representative of the PIO informed the Court that the information sought by the appellant falls under the jurisdiction of Executive Engineer, WRD, Tezu Division. Hence, the PIO couldn't furnish the documents. As such, the Court directed that a fresh hearing notice should be sent to the concerned authority. Accordingly, the Court fixed the next date of hearing on 23rd of March' 2022.

The 2nd hearing for the case was heard on 20th day of April' 2022. Both the parties were present. Heard both the parties. The PIO informed the Court that he didn't receive the Form-A of the appellant so he wasn't aware of the case. In this, the Court directed the PIO to take a photocopy of the Form-A via phone or any other means and furnish the information sought by the appellant on or before the next date of hearing. The appellant was also directed by the Court to report to the Commission about his redressal of satisfaction/dissatisfaction on receipt of the documents on or before the next date of hearing. Accordingly, the Court fixed the next date of hearing for the case on 11th May' 2022.

The 3rd hearing for the case was heard on 11th day of May' 2022. Both the parties were present. The appellant and PIO both were absent. APIO Mr. Saju Ngadong represented the case on-behalf of the PIO. The case was heard ex-parte. The APIO had furnished the remaining documents in the Court itself. Since, the appellant was absent the documents couldn't be furnished to him. Accordingly, the Court fixed the next date of hearing on 25.05.2022.

The 4th hearing for the case was heard on 25th day of May' 2022. The Appellant was present but the PIO was absent. The case was heard ex-parte. Since the PIO was absent the case couldn't be discussed further. As such the Court gave a chance to the case for another hearing. Accordingly, the Court fixed the next date of hearing for the case on 15th June' 2022.

The 5th hearing for the case was heard on 15th day of June' 2022. Both the parties were absent. Since both the parties were absent the matter couldn't be discussed further. As such, the Court fixed another date of hearing for the case on 07th September' 2022.

The 6th hearing for the case was heard on 07th day of September' 2022. The appellant was present but the PIO was absent. APIO, Mr. Sujit Paul(J.E) represented the case on-behalf of the PIO. The PIO-cum-EE(WRD) Onit Panyang, though not present was heard through audio hearing. According to the PIO the information was already furnished by him to the appellant. While on the other hand the appellant informed that not a single information have been furnished to him. In this view, the Court directed the PIO to come with proof of furnishing the documents to the appellant in next hearing of the case. Hence, the Court fixed the next date of hearing for the case on 27th September' 2022.

The 7th hearing for the case was heard on 27th day of September' 2022. Both the parties were present. Heard both the parties. The documents sought by the appellant has been provided by the PIO during the Court proceedings itself and the appellant has been directed to receive the documents. The Court further directed the appellant to go through the documents received. Later, the appellant expressed his satisfaction for the documents received from the PIO and pleaded before the Court to dispose of the case. As such the Court ordered to dispose of the case and no such hearings for this case will be entertained further in the Commission's Court.

Considering all the above aspects into account, I find this appeal fit to be disposed off 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 28th day of November' 2023.

Sd/(GUMJUM HAIDER)

State Information Commissioner,

APIC, Itanagar.

Dated, Itanagar, the November ' 2023.

Memo.No.APIC- 407/2021//.110 Copy to:-

- 1. The PIO—cum-Executive Engineer, WRD, Namsai Division, District- Namsai, PIN 792103, Arunachal Pradesh, for information & necessary action please.
- 2. The PIO-cum-Executive Engineer, WRD, Tezu Division, District- Lohit, PIN- 792001, Arunachal Pradesh, for information & necessary action please.
- 3. Shri Adv. Mamu Sono, Sood Village, PO/PS- Naharlagun, ICR, PIN 791110, Arunachal Pradesh, PH-9436215521 , for information & necessary action please.
- 4. The Computer Operator for uploading on the Website of APIC, please.

5. Office copy.

Registar/Dy.Registrar,

APIC, Itanagar.

Deputy Registrar

Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission Itanagar.