



ARUNACHAL PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION

ITANAGAR.

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

Case No. APIC- 23/2026.

**APPELLANT
RESPONDENT**

: Shri Nabam Tadap, vill. Langdung Sangdupota.
: The PIO, o/o the E.E (RWD), Papum Poma Division,
Papum Pare District (A.P)

ORDER

This is an appeal under Section 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005 received from Shri Nabam Tadap for non-furnishing of below mentioned information by the PIO, o/o the E.E (RWD), Papum Poma Division, Papum Pareas sought for by him under section 6(1) (Form-A) of RTI Act, 2005 vide his application dated 20.09.2025.

A. Particular of information: c/o road from Depra to Balijan (upgradation) Length 25.26 (PMGSY) Scheme.

B. Details of information required:

1. The Guideline copy of C/O Road from Depra to Balijan(Up gradation) Length 25.26 km.
2. The sanctioned order copy of C/O. Road from Depra to Balijan(Up gradation) Length 25.26 km.
3. The detailed Project of said project.
4. The Notice inviting tender copy with date and published News Paper name/E-tender called if any.
5. The check list of total firms participated during the NIT.
6. The name and details of the firm to whom the road project was awarded.
7. The Bill of Quantity (BOQ) of the winning firm along with showing the comparative statement of L1, L2.8&13 bidders.
8. The acceptance letter copy by the winning firm.
9. The Geo tagging copy of the three stages: - Before the project commenced, after the project started and after the completion of the project.
10. The Agreement copy between the executing agency and working agency for maintenance of the said project.
11. The total tender bidding amount.
12. The copy of counter foil of check in every payment.
13. The utilization certificate of the said project.
14. The measurement book of every bill paid for the said project.
15. The approval letter by Chief Engineer RWD and the Superintending Engineer RWD of tender balance amount.
16. The copy of cost justification of balance amount/fund.
17. Whether the surrender amount has been utilized or deposited? If utilized provide the work Order or tender documents where the amount was utilized?

C. Period for which information asked for: 2020-2025.

Brief facts emerging from the appeal :

Records emerging from the appeal disclose that the appellant, Shri Nabam Tadap had requested the PIO for the aforementioned information/documents but failed to obtain the same which prompted him to appeal before the Superintending engineer, RWD, Itanagar Circle, the First Appellate Authority (FAA) under Section 19 (1) of the RTI Act, 2005 vide his Memo of Appeal dtd. 19.11.2025. However, the appellant failed yet again to obtain the information and therefore, he preferred 2nd appeal before this Commission under section 19 (3) of the RTI Act. 2005 vide his Memo of appeal dt. 05.01.2026.

This Commission notices that the First Appellate Authority, i.e the SE, RWD, Itanagar Circle has not adjudicated this appeal under section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005.

The First Appellate Authority, being well versed with the functioning of the department, ought to have adjudicated the appeal and passed a suitable order in speaking form stating therein the reasons for his decision. In doing so, the FAA, as the quasi-judicial authority under the RTI Act, ought to have heard both the parties and passed a reasonable order on merit.

The instant case, having not been adjudicated by the First Appellate Authority as mandated under section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, the Commission deems it appropriate to remand the appeal to the First Appellate Authority for adjudication. The First Appellate Authority, the Superintending Engineer, RWD, Itanagar Circle, 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 the appellant in his application, whether the same was and could be provided or whether the same is exempted under the relevant provisions of section 8 and 9 of the RTI Act and pass a speaking order giving justification for his decision.

This appeal is, accordingly, remanded to the First Appellate Authority, the Superintending Engineer, RWD, Itanagar Circle , Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh for adjudication and passing an appropriate speaking order within 4(four) weeks from the date of receipt of this order. The appellant may, if dissatisfied or aggrieved by the decision of the First Appellate Authority, prefer Second Appeal before this Commission for which no cost need be paid.

Given under my hand and seal of this Commission on this 6th May, 2026.

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

Memo No. APIC-23/2026 / 815

Dated Itanagar, the

7 May, 2026

Copy to:

1. The Superintending Engineer (RWD), Govt. of A.P, Itanagar Circle (A.P), the First Appellate Authority (FAA) PIN: 791111 for information and compliance..
2. The PIO, o/o E.E (RWD), Papum Poma Division, Papum Pare District (A.P) PIN: 791111 for information.
3. Shri Nabam Tadap, Village Langdung Sangdupota PO NIT Jote, PS Baliyan District A.P PIN:791113 Mobile NO. 9436013355/ 7085999455 for information and follow-up with the o/o the FAA for early hearing of the appeal.
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