



ARUNACHAL PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION

ITANAGAR.

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

Vide Case No. APIC- 718/2023.

APPELLANT

: Shri Riya Taram, RTI Secy. (ALSU) Adv. Lokam Tadam,
c/o Hotel River View Naharlagun

RESPONDENT

: The PIO, o/o the Executive Engineer (RWD), Tezu
Division, Lohit District, Arunachal Pradesh.

Date of hearing

: 25.09.2024, 30.10.2024, 27.11.2024, 10.01.2025 and
31.01.2025.

Date of decision

: 31.01.2025

ORDER

This is an appeal under Section 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005 received from Shri Riya Taram for denial of information by the PIO, o/o the Executive Engineer (RWD), Tezu Division, Lohit District, Arunachal Pradesh as sought for by him under section 6(1) (Form-A) of RTI Act, 2005 vide application dated 15.05.2023.

Records as revealed from the appeal are that the appellant herein had asked for 32 point detailed information from the o/o the PIO regarding the implementation of projects under the SIDF/MLA LAD/UNTIED FUND phase-I during the FYs-2019-20, 2020-21, 2021-22 and 2022-23. But apparently, having failed to obtain the sought for information from the PIO, the appellant had approached the FAA, the CE(RWD) Eastern Zone, Govt. of A.P vide his memo of appeal dt.28.06.2024. Having yet again to receive the information from the PIO, despite having approached the FAA, the appellant preferred this appeal before this Commission under section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005 vide Memo of Appeal dt.28.07.2023 which had been registered as APIC-718/2023.

This appeal was, accordingly, listed and heard for 4(four) times.

In the 1st hearing on 25.09.24 wherein Er. Ms Khyoda Mema, the APIO, o/o the E.E, (RWD) Tezu attended through VC and the Appellant, Shri Riya Taram attended in person, this Commission directed the APIO to attend the hearing in person with the duly authenticated documents sought by the appellant.

In the 2nd hearing on 30/10/24, wherein both the APIO and the Appellant were present physically, the appellant was directed to go through the information(s) furnished to him by the PIO and report his satisfaction or otherwise to this Commission within 2 (weeks) so as to fix the date of next hearing, if required.

As directed, the Appellant, Shri Riya Taram, vide his letter dated 15/11/24 addressed to this Commission, submitted that the information(s) provided by the o/o of PIO is either not furnished in systematic manner or furnished incomplete and not as per his application in (Form-A).

In the 3rd hearing on 27.11.2024, the APIO also brought in the remaining documents which, however, could not be handed over to the Appellant as he was absent. Further, the deficiencies pointed out by him in his letter dated 15/11/24 about the information so received earlier could not be clarified and settled.

This Commission, after hearing the PIO and upon perusal of the letter dated 30/10/24 forwarding the information to the Appellant, adjourned the hearing of the appeal to 10/01/25 and directed the APIO to attend the hearing personally with the remaining documents re-arranging year-wise and scheme-wise systematically as requested by the Appellant.

The Appellant was also directed to return to the APIO the documents that he received earlier so that the APIO could re-arrange the same and hand over to him on or before the next date of hearing as assured by the APIO.

In the 4th hearing on 10th January, 2025, the APIO, Ms. Khyoda Meema was present physically as directed but the Appellant, Shri Riya Taram, did not turn up nor did he return the documents to the APIO to enable the APIO to re-arrange the same despite clear direction of this Commission in order dt. 27.11.2024. In the hearing the APIO brought in the remaining documents like photographs and Utilization Certificate which could not be handed over to the Appellant as he was absent.

The APIO expressing her dismay over the repeated absence of the appellant as she has to come with documents from long distance wasting her valuable office time, pleaded for closure of the case as the appellant seems no longer interested in the information.

The Commission, after hearing the APIO, directed the appellant to be present personally in next hearing on 31st Jan. 2025 with warning that if he remains absent again on that day with the compliance report of earlier interim order dated 27/11/2024 the case will be disposed of as being not interested any more by him.

In today's hearing on 31.01.2025, the APIO attended the hearing through VC but the appellant did not attend yet again despite clear and unequivocal warning. This Commission, therefore, is of the considered opinion that the appellant is, indeed, no longer interested in the remaining information but is satisfied with the documents so far received from the o/o the PIO in view whereof, this appeal stands disposed of and closed.

Given under my hand and seal of this Commission on this 31st January, 2025.

Sd/-

(S. TSERING BAPPU)

State Information Commissioner,
APIC, Itanagar.

Dated Itanagar, the 4 February, 2025

Memo No. APIC- 718/2023/ 553

Copy to:

1. The PIO, o/o the Executive Engineer (RWD), Tezu Division, Lohit District, A.P for information.
2. The APIO, o/o the E.E (RWD), Tezu Division, Lohit District, A.P. for information.
3. Shri Riya Taram, RTI Secy. (ALSU) Adv. Lokam Tadam, c/o Hotel River View Naharlagun PIN: 791110 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.
- 7.

Registrar
Assam Pradesh Information Commission
Itanagar
Registrar/ Deputy Registrar
APIC, Itanagar.