





ARUNACHAL PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION ITANAGAR. An Appeal Case U/S 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005 Case No. APIC- 341/2024.

APPELLANT : Shri Riya Taram, Bengia Tahar and Lokam Namdu, Huto Vill. Jolang, Itanagar.

RESPONDENT : The PIO, o/o the Executive Engineer (PWD), Sangram Division, KurungKumey District (A.P)

<u>ORDER</u>

This is an appeal under Section 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005 received from Shri Riya Taram, Bengia Tahar and Lokam Namdu for non-furnishing of below mentioned information by the PIO, o/o the Executive Engineer (PWD), Sangram Division, Kurung Kumey District (A.P) as sought for by them under section 6(1) (Form-A) of RTI Act, 2005 vide their application dated 22.08.2024.

A) Particular of information: Information against RE/BE (2020-21)

B) Details of information:

- 1. The List of Scheme.
- 2. The Name of Work List with Geotag Report/ Sanction Order/Technical Sanction (TS) Order copy.
- 3. Details of Project Report (OPR)/Estimate copy.
- 4. The List of Work Order copy with Cheque book counterfoil/leaf /demand draft/ Banker Cheque /deposited slip/Challan and PFMS Transaction details as according to the Amount which mentioned in Work Order/Sanction Order/Name of work list.
- 5. Name of Contractors/Firm/ Enterprise with their bank account number.
- 6. The deposited Slip/Voucher/Treasury Challan of GST Amount/Money which deposited to Govt. account against Royalty by Firm/Enterprise account with GST updates.
- 7. Xerox copy of all the Trading License/Firm/Enterprise.
- 8. The Deposited slip/Challan /voucher/Transaction of GST Money deposited to Government account against Royalty by Executive Engineer, division Account/Firm/Enterprise Account and also Mention the Owner Name of firm/enterprise/Proprietor Name. Give reason What Firm /Enterprise Owner/Proprietor is to AE/JE who run the Firm /Enterprise ?
- 9. Details of Payment with Money Receipt of Contractors/Firm/Enterprise.
- 10. Bank Account Statement of EE Division with its Account Number.
- 11. The Letter/petition/LOC/LOA which wrote to the Branch Manager of State Bank of India to release of Fund to Executive Engineer Account by Chief Engineer PWD.

- 12. Measurement book (MB) with page number/Hand Receipt and Payees Name.
- 13. First & Final Bill Copy/Give the Name of various Deduction as percent from Contractor payment.
- 14. The Photocopy of Work Site before Starting of work /Completion of work site with exact location.
- 15. Certified Photocopy of all work Site by concern Officer.
- 16. The Name of Officers and Officials who handled/Executed the Works.
- 17. The Description of worksite location before start of work.
- 18. The Billing details Sheet copy of works.
- 19. Give the Bank Account Statement and Amount Transferred to Respective Bank 2, Account of Various Assistant Engineer (AE) Sub-Division from Executive Engineer Ban Account of Division/Firm/Enterprise Account with its Bank Account Number.
- 20. The List of AE/JE of department with their Used Firm/Enterprise.
- 21. NIT Copy/Date of NIT Tender float/Total number of Bidder/Total Apply of Firms/Name of Selected Firm/Enterprise & Contractors/Press Letter Paper Cutting/Awarded FIRM Details/Cheque book counterfoil/leaf with Account Number of Firm or Contractor to whom the payment has been made/UC.

Brief facts emerging from the appeal:

The records emerging from the appeal disclosed that the appellants had requested the PIO for the aforementioned information but failed to obtain the same which prompted them to approach the First Appellate Authority (FAA), the Chief Engineer (PWD) Central Zone-A, Govt. of A.P, vide their Memo of Appeal dt.25.09.2024. But having failed yet again to obtain the requested information from the PIO, they filed their 2nd appeal before this Commission under section 19(3) of the RTI Act vide Memo of Appeal dt.19.11.2024.

This appeal was, accordingly, registered as APIC- 341/2024 and listed for hearing 4(four) times on 15.01.2025, 21.03.2025, 11.04.2025 and 14.05.2025 (today).

Hearing and decision:

This Commission on 15.01.2025, upon hearing the parties, had passed the following direction:

"This Commission, on careful perusal of the 22 (Twenty two) point information sought by the Appellant, found some of the points are infact repetitive while some are not relevant. Therefore, this Commission suggested the appellant to reduce his demand for the information and priorities the ones which are more important which he agreed to. The appellant has, thus, not pressed for the following:

- 7. Sl. No. 8 (as the it is repetition of Sl. No.6);
- 8. Sl. No.13 (being repetition of Sl.6);
- 9. Sl. No. 19 and 20 (not relevant)

The appellant also agreed not to press for the information which are not available with the PIO's Division. This Commission, however, directs the PIO to make sincere effort to collate and collect whatever information as sought for by the appellant and furnish to him and also furnish specific reasons against those which are not available in his Division.

This Commission observes that the appellant has filed another RTI application of same dt.22.08.2024 before the same PIO regarding the schemes / projects implemented under the SIDF during the same financial year, 2020-21 which has been registered in this Commission as APIC-347/2024. This Commission also finds that the submission of the parties are also same in both the appeals. Therefore, this Commission deems it appropriate to direct the PIO to comply with the above direction within 2(two) months from the date of receipt of this order i.e one month after compliance of the direction passed in APIC-347/24.

In other words, the information sought for in respect of the SIDF(2020-21) shall be furnished within one month from the date of receipt of order passed in APIC-347/24 and the information sought for in respect of the RE/BE (2020-21) shall be furnished within one month thereafter.

List this appeal on 21.03.2025 (Friday) at 2 pm."

In the hearing on 21.03.2025 *none of the parties appeared*. This Commission, taking a serious note on the absence of the parties, the appellant in particular, without any information, had warned the Appellant that if he fails to appear in the next date of hearing also, the appeal shall be closed as not being interest by him for further adjudication.

In the next hearing on 11.04.2025, both the PIO and the appellant were absent but he sent a letter dt.11.04.2024 informing that he is having a medical emergency case and requested for adjournment of the case to an appropriate date. The appeal was, thus, listed again today on 14th May, 2025. But today also both the appellant and the PIO are absent without any intimation.

This continued absence of the parties, particularly, the appellants shows that he is not interested in the adjudication of this appeal any further. As such, no further hearing of the appeal is required in this Commission. Resultantly, this appeal stands disposed of and closed.

Given under my hand and seal of this Commission on this 14th May, 2025.

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

Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission Halfager

Memo No. APIC-341/2024/ 737

Copy to:

- 1. The First Appellate Authority (FAA), the Chief Engineer (PWD) Central Zone-A, Govt. of A.P, Itanagar for information.
- 2. The PIO, o/o the Executive Engineer, (PWD), Sangram Division, KurungKumey District (A.P) PIN: 791118 for information.
- Shri Riya Taram, Bengia Tahar and Lokam Namdu, Huto Vill. Jolang, c/o Riang Store Jollang near Catholic Church PIN: 791113 Mobile No. 9383103387/9402443699 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 Deputy Registrar Arunachal Predesh Jahrmation Commissio Managar

n 1987 print 1999 print 1992 Million - Schule Million (1997 Print Print