



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

**An Appeal Case U/S 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005**  
**Case No. APIC- 299/2024.**

Shri Techi Reeb, Ganga Village, PO- R.K Mission,  
PS- Chimpu, District Papum Pare (A.P)

**: APPELLANT**

**Vs**

The PIO, o/o the Executive Engineer (E),  
Capital Electrical Division, Itanagar (A.P).

**:RESPONDENT**

**ORDER**

This is an appeal under Section 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005 received from Shri Techi Reeb for non-furnishing of information by the PIO, o/o the Executive Engineer (E), Capital Electrical Division, Itanagar as sought for by him under section 6(1) (Form-A) of RTI Act, 2005 vide his application dated 10.06.2024.

The appellant had sought for the following information:

**(A) Particular of information:**

1. Information regarding augmentation & improvement of 11kv feeders under unclear CESD- IV of B.E 2023-24;
2. Smart street lightning on 9m Octangle G.I pole with 135 Warm LED white color luminarie along the highway from Chandranagar bridge point to Papu Nallah (10.5km);
3. Creation of infrastructure for missing link of 33kv & 11kv down strear links to 132kv/33kv and 33/11kv respectively Raj Bhawan, Chimpu bay extension B.E 2019-20;
4. Creation of infrastructure for missing link of 33kv & 11kv down strear links to 132kv/33kv and 33/11kv respectively Raj Bhawan, Chimpu bay extension B.E 2018-19;
5. Augmentation & improvement of 11k feeders under unclear CESD- I of B.E 2023-24;
6. Augmentation & extension of distribution system upper woka village in JullyItanagar/ R.E 2023-24;
7. RE-alignment & Renovation of 33kv feeder under CED;
8. Extension of 11kv installation of distribution transformer and new extension line for Seka & Nerba Colony.

**(B) Details of information required:**

- (a). Photo copies of memorandum/office order of power Commissioner or Chief Engineer work for not NIT. 2019/2024 above mention work.

**(C) Period for which information asked for: 2019/2024.**

**Brief facts emerging from the appeal.**

Records revealed that in response to the applicant's request for information as above, the PIO, o/o the E.E (E), Capital Electrical Division, Itanagar, vide letter dated 13/06/24, intimated the Applicant/Appellant that the requested information could not be furnished as the information sought for is generalized one and not specific.

The Applicant/Appellant, dissatisfied with the above response of the PIO, approached the F.A.A, the Superintendent Engineer (E), APEC-1-CUM-COORD, Naharlagun, vide Memo of Appeal dated 12/07/24 in response whereof the F.A. A, vide letter dated 06/08/24, while endorsing the response of the PIO dated 13/06/24, suggested the Appellant to seek one particular scheme/financial year for early and easy disclosure of information.

Records further revealed that the F.A.A had also conducted hearing on 16/09/24 wherein both the PIO and the Appellant were present and considered 5 (five) appeals dated 11/03/24, 13/03/24, 27/03/24, 07/06/24 and 10/06/24.

The F.A.A, vide order dt. 20.09.2024, after hearing both the parties, disposed of the five appeals including the application dated 10/06/24 holding that the information sought by the Appellant was not furnished to him as the information sought were either not available or it was not specific.

The appellant, being dissatisfied with the order of the F.A.A as above, filed second appeal before this Commission under section-19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005 vide his Memo of Appeal dated 17/10/24 which has been registered as APIC.NO. 299/2024.

#### **Hearing and decision:**

The appeal was, thus, listed for hearing on 11/12/24. However, the Appellant, Shri Techri Reeb, did not attend the hearing but requested for adjournment to an appropriate date.

The hearing was, hence, adjourned to 24/01/25 wherein the appellant was present and Er. Shri Ripon Kabak, AE (Plng) represented the PIO.

During the course of hearing, the appellant, while reiterating his demand for the information as sought by him, pleaded for appropriate direction to the PIO to provide the information. The appellant further pleaded that although the o/o the PIO had furnished the information to him against the Sl. No.1 to 8 of his application, the information against the Sl. No.(b)(a) i.e Photo copies of memorandum/office order of power Commissioner or Chief Engineer dispensing with the NIT process in the award and execution of the works was not furnished to him.

The representative of the PIO, on the other hand, responded with the submission that most of the schemes/works were executed on emergency basis and the schemes were below Rs.50 lakhs.

This Commission, upon hearing the parties and on perusal of the documents furnished by the PIO as produced by the appellant, held that the appellant is entitled to a reasoned and satisfactory reply to his query at Sl. No.(b)(a). The PIO was, therefore, directed in the interim to furnish copies of memorandum/office order / approval from any authority, *if any*, for executing the works in question without tendering process and if there is none then an appropriate reply citing justifiable reasons may be furnished to the appellant on or before the next date of hearing which was fixed on 21.02.2025. The appellant, however, did not appear on 21.02.2025 for some personal reasons.

The case was, therefore, adjourned and listed on 21.03.2025 wherein the appellant and the APIO, Er. Shri Ripon Kabak, AE (Plng) representing the PIO were present.

Heard the parties.

The appellant producing copies of DPR in respect of some of the projects costing above Rs. 50.00 lakhs undertaken by the o/o the PIO, re-iterated his demand for the Photo copies of memorandum/office order of power Commissioner or Chief Engineer for not issuing NIT against the works as sought for by him at Sl.No.(b)(a) of his application. On the other hand, the APIO, reiterating the earlier submission that most of the schemes/works were executed on emergency basis and the schemes were below Rs.50. lakhs, further submitted that the o/o the PIO, vide letter dt.21.02.2025 addressed to the Registrar, had already replied (with copy endorsed to the appellant) that "**no such Memorandum/Office order has been received by this office from the higher authorities**". The appellant, however, submitted that he did not receive the copy of any such letter from the o/o the PIO.

This Commission, upon hearing the parties and considering that the PIO had already furnished the reply against the left out documents {Sl.No.(b)(a)}, the xerox copy whereof has been provided to the appellant during the hearing, holds that no further adjudication on this appeal is warranted and the appeal is, accordingly, disposed of and closed.

Sd/-

(S. TSERING BAPPU)

State Information Commissioner,  
APIC, Itanagar.

Dated Itanagar, the 24 March 2025

Memo No. APIC-299/2024/

673

Copy to:

1. The F.A.A, the S.E (E), A.P Electrical Circle No. 1-cum-Co-ordn, DoP, Govt. of A.P Naharlagun for information.
2. The PIO, o/o the Executive Engineer (E), Capital Electrical Division, Itanagar for information.
3. Shri Techi Reeb, Ganga Village, PO- R.K Mission, PS- Chimpu, District Papum Pare (A.P) PIN: 791113 Mobile No. 8787480872 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

Registrar  
Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission  
Itanagar