



ARUNACHAL PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION
ITANAGAR.

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

Case No. APIC- 170/2026.

(Summon to appear in person)

(Or.5 R.3 of CPC)

APPELLANT
RESPONDENT

: Shri Tamchi Gungte near KV-II Chimpu.

: The PIO, o/o the EE (RWD), Poma Division, Yupia
Papum Pare District.

ORDER /SUMMONS

This is an appeal under Section 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005 received from Shri Tamchi Gungte for non-furnishing of below mentioned information by the PIO, o/o the EE (RWD), Poma Division, Yupia Papum Pare District as sought for by him under section 6(1) (Form-A) of RTI Act, 2005 vide his application dated 09.10.2025.

A. Particular of information: C/o "Total list of Plan & Non-plan Works/ projects sponsored by State fund/Central fund (such as SIDF/ BE/ RE/ RIDF/ SADA/ ADA/ MLA-LAD/ MP-LAD/ SPA/Article275(1)/ PMJKV erstwhile MsDP/ Untied/ Tied/ PM-DeVINE/ NEC/ NESIDS/ Non-BADP/ SASCI/ VVP/PMGSY/ Maintenance works etc.) executed under the concern division" from the financial year 2020-21 to 2025-26.

B. Details of information required:

1. Copy of Total List of Completed Projects/works (Plan & non-plan) in which the Security Deposits has been refunded to the contractors (submitted in FDR etc. and deducted from each running bill and final bill @2.5% minimum/7.5% maximum, of the gross amount of Bill) under the division for each financial year from 2020-21 to 2025-26 with proper date of completion details.
2. Copy of Total list of projects/works (Plan & non-plan) in which the Security Deposits has been on hold despite the completion of projects/work regulated under Clause 17 of GCC for each respective financial year from 2020-21 to 2025-26.
3. Copy of Register Of Security Deposit Form CPWA 67 maintained in the Division for each financial year from 2020-21 to 2025-26 in respect of the subject mentioned above.
4. Copy of Refund of Security Deposit (along with supporting documents of refund) to the Contractors as per agreement made in Forms CPWD 7 & 8 on the completion of works regulated by Clause 17 of GCC in respect of serial no.1 mention above for each financial year 2020-21 to 2025-26.
5. Furnish all the above documents with CTC & proper manner (i.e. in serial wise with properly Index, proper paging of each financial year and separate books for each financial year for easy & better understanding).

This appeal was heard on 29.07.2026 wherein the appellant, Shri Tamchi Gungte was present in person while the PIO was represented by his Counsel, Advocate Shri Yitar Lombi.

This Commission, after hearing the parties and perusing the written submission made by the PIO, had passed an interim order dt.29.07.26 as under:

"This Commission also notices that prima facie the details of documents/information as sought for by the appellant in his RTI application, appear to be voluminous but the appellant clarified that of the 21 Funding Heads, the o/o the PIO might not have implemented any scheme or project under some of the Funding Heads such as, the MLA-LAD/MP-LAD Fund etc. Therefore, he contends that it is not correct to deny the requested information merely on the ground that the information sought for is voluminous and not- sufficiently specific.

In adverting to the instant issue/controversy raised by the PIO in his written submission, this Commission deems it relevant to refer to the principle of law settled by the Apex Court in the case of CBSE & Anr. Vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay & ors. in Civil Appeal No.6456 of 2011 whereby the Hon'ble Court held that right to information is a cherished right and that right to information which are the tools to bring transparency and accountability should be enforced strictly. The Apex court at the same time, however, held that indiscriminate and impractical demand for disclosure of all sundry information not related to transparency and accountability in the functioning of the public authority would be counterproductive as it will adversely affect the efficiency of the administration.

What emerges from the principle of law as above is that the provisions of the RTI Act are to be implemented by harmonizing the rights of the citizen under the RTI Act on the one hand and the efficient and unobstructed functioning of the public authorities due to indiscriminate queries on the other.

In the light of the above principle of law, this Commission directs the PIO to scrutinize and find out as to the actual number of Funding Heads out of the 21 numbers of Funding Heads under which any scheme/project was executed by his Division and also the actual number of F.Ys mentioned in the RTI application and report the same to this Commission on 28.08.2026, the next date of hearing to enable this Commission to proceed further for adjudication of the appeal in accordance with the provisions of RTI Act, 2005."

Today on 28.08.2026, the appellant appeared through VC while the PIO is represented by Er. Takam Majing, AE-cum-APIO in person, accompanied by PIO's Counsel, Shri Yikar Lombi also in person.

Heard the parties.

The APIO and the Ld. Counsel, producing the copies of the list of schemes/projects executed by the PIO's Division during the financial year 2020-21 to 2025-26, reiterated that the information sought by the Applicant is voluminous in nature and covers a large number of records, documents, works, periods, locations, and/or transactions and also that the request, as made, does not clearly identify any particular work, specific project, work order, bill, voucher, measurement book, or other precise record. Further that the RTI application does not specify the particular name of the work or project in respect of which the information is sought. In the absence of a specific project, scheme, name of work, work order number, project identification, location, financial year, or other identifying particulars, it is extremely difficult to identify the exact records

On the other hand, the appellant, submitted that the information /documents sought for by him pertains only to security deposits refunded to the Contractors in respect of the completed projects, such as the list of projects, copy of Registers, the copies of letters by which the refund was made as per the CPWD norms. He also stated that during the hearing before the FAA, the PIO had fairly assured to furnish the requested information within 45 (forty five) days but the PIO failed to stick to his assurance.

This commission, upon hearing the parties, conclude that although the information requested is about the details of only one single item in respect of completed projects and are not covered under section 8 or 9 of the RTI Act, the collection and collation of the same from the records would require substantial time as the information pertains to 6(six) FYs. Therefore, this Commissions deems it appropriate to allow adequate time to the PIO to collate the information and furnish the same to the appellant and as such the PIO is directed to furnish the details of information along with the list of completed projects within 3(three) months from the date of receipt of this order and report the compliance therewith on 27.11.2026 so as not to constrain this Commission to invoke section 20 of the RTI Act.

Given under my hand and seral of this Commission on this 28th August, 2026.

• **NOW THEREFORE**, you are hereby summoned to appear in person or online in the Hon'ble Court of Shri Sangyal Tsering Bappu, **SIC on 27.11.2026 (Friday) at 2 pm** to answer the claims, and you are directed to produce on that day all the documents upon which you intend to rely in support of your claims/defense.

Take notice that, in default of your appearance, on the day above- mentioned, the matter will be heard and determined in your absence.

To avail online hearing please at least notify or get in touch one day prior to the hearing, download "**WEBEX MEETING APP**" from Google Play store. For further technical assistance Shri Himanshu Verma, IT Consultant (Mobile no. 8319014957) maybe contacted.

Sd/-

(S. TSERING BAPPU)

State Information Commissioner,

APIC, Itanagar.

Memo No. APIC-170/2026 / 869

Dated Itanagar, the 28th Sept., 2026

Copy to:

1. The Chief Engineer (RWD), Western Zone Itanagar, Papum Pare District, the First Appellate Authority (FAA) for information and ensuring compliance by the PIO concerned.
2. The PIO, o/o the EE (RWD), Poma Division, Yupia Papum Pare District PIN: 791110 for information and compliance.
3. Shri Tamchi Gungte, near KV-II School Chimpu PIN: 791113 Mobile NO. 8258820863/9402798349 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.

Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission
Itanagar