



**ARUNACHAL PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**ITANAGAR.**

**An Appeal Case U/S 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005**  
**Case No. APIC-89/2025.**

**APPELLANT** : Shri Tamchi Gungte, Near KV-II School Chimpu

**RESPONDENT** : The PIO, o/o the Executive Engineer (PWD),  
Govt. of A.P, Roing Division, District : Lower  
Dibang Valley.

**ORDER**

This is an appeal under Section 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005 received from Shri Tamchi Gungte for non-furnishing of 25(twenty five) point information on c/o "Improvement of Bomjir-Paglam road (Bizari to Anpum, L-13.400 km)" during the financial year 2021-22 by the PIO, o/o the Executive Engineer (PWD), Roing Division, District : Lower Dibang Valley as sought for by him under section 6(1) (Form-A) of RTI Act, 2005 vide his application dated 14.10.2024.

The PIO herein was imposed penalty of Rs.25,000.00 under section 20(1) of the RTI Act, 2005 vide order dt. 17.10.2025 in consequence of his failure to comply with the provisions of the RTI Act and non-compliance with the order dt. 09.06.2025 and subsequent order dt.28.08.2025 of this Commission.

As directed by this Commission by its order dt.17.10.2025, the PIO had deposited the penalty amount for Rs.25,000.00 vide online Treasury Challan No. GRN AR012631101202526P dt.21.10.2025. The PIO also furnished the affidavit against the RTI query No. 24 i.e the details of actual payment made to the contractor as directed by this Commission in it aforesaid order.

The affidavit furnished by the PIO was handed over to the appellant who, however, complained vide his letter dt.31.10.25, that declaration made in the affidavit by the PIO is repetition of earlier replies whereas his demand was for the documentary evidence of actual payment made to the contractor such as the cheque numbers and counterfoils and as such the information is incomplete and misleading.

The extract of the appellant's letter is reproduced hereunder:

*"Respected Sir,*

*With due respect I am writing this to inform the honourable court that the declaration made in Affidavit by the PIO is misleading, as I didn't not receive any new documents (actual payments made to the contractor, i.e cheque and voucher copy) as per the last court order on 23 Sept 2025. So, I believe that the PIO, is wasting the resources and time of both the court and appellant, thereafter it shall be treated as contempt of court by the PIO for not complying with the commission order.*



Therefore, I request the honorable court to look into the matter and take a necessary action under section 20(2) of the RTI act 2005 as mentioned in the previous order dated 16 Sepi 2025.

Yours faithfully,

Sd/-  
Tamchi Gungte  
(Appellant)"

This Commission upon perusal of the complaint of the appellant as above and the contents of the affidavit dt.22.10.2025 furnished by the PIO, notices that in so far as the payment to the contractor is concerned, the declaration made therein i.e through Govt. cheque and the vouchers is in consonance with the earlier replies furnished to the appellant. The documents furnished earlier i.e the copies of memorandum of payment, indeed contain the cheque numbers and the voucher numbers. However, what the appellant actually has sought during the course of hearing is the documentary evidence i.e the counterfoils of the cheque mentioned in the Memorandum of payment.

In the premise as above, the PIO is directed to provide to the appellant the counterfoils of those cheques through which the payments were made to the contractor, if the o/o the PIO still holds those counterfoils. *It is again made clear that if the o/o the PIO no longer holds the cheque counterfoils he shall declare so through an affidavit in categorical terms as required under section 18(3) (c) of the RTI Act and rule 5(vi) of the AP Information Commission (Appeal Procedure) Rules, 2005 and furnish the same to the appellant with intimation to this Commission. It is further made clear that furnishing an incomplete information attracts the provisions of section 18(1)(e) of the RTI Act.*

The PIO shall comply with the above direction within 2(two) weeks from the date of receipt of this order for further consideration of the appeal.

Given under my hand and seal of this Commission on this 6<sup>th</sup> Nov., 2025.

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

Memo No. APIC- 89/2025 Dated Itanagar, the 6<sup>th</sup> Nov., 2025

Copy to:

1. The Chief Engineer (PWD), Govt. of A.P, Eastern Zone Thana Road Namsai, (A.P), the First Appellate Authority (FAA) for information and ensuring compliance by the PIO.
2. The PIO, o/o the Executive Engineer (PWD), Roing Division, Lower Dibang Valley District, PIN – 792110 for information and compliance.
3. Shri Tamchi Gungte, Near KV-II School Chimpu, Po/PS Chimpu, Distt. Papum Pare (A.P) PIN: 791113, Mobile No. 9233567279 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  
Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission  
Itanagar