



ARUNACHAL PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION, APIC
ITANAGAR

An Complaint case U/S 18(1) of RTI Act, 2005
Vide Case No. Appeal-07/2024,

BEFORE THE COURT OF SHRI KHOPEY THALEY, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER

Shri Signal Yirang

Appellant

Versus

PIO-cum- EE (PWD), Pasighat Division

Respondent

Date of hearing : 10/03/2025

Date of decision/Judgment : 10/03/2025

INFORMATION COMMISSIONER : Shri Khopey Thaley

Relevant facts emerging from Appeal:

RTI application file on : 04/07/2024
PIO replied on : 17/07/2024
First appeal file on :
First Appellate Authority's order :
2nd Appeal dated : 28/10/2024

Information sought :

The appellant file an RTI Application dated 04/07/2024 seeking Details regarding DPR of C/o Flood Control Work at Kadang River which in Sl. No. 929 in the list of projects approved under the State Infrastructure Development Fund Phase-I during the year 2023-24.

As per the case record, PIO has never conducted the hearing in his jurisdiction.

Feeling aggrieved and dissatisfied, appellant approached the Commission with instant Second Complain dated 28/10/2024.

The following were present.

Appellant : Shri Signal Yirang absent during the hearing.
Respondent : PIO-cum-EE(PWD), Pasighat Division is represented by Er. Tapang Tatak, AE.

Contd..2/

JUDGEMENT / ORDER

This is a complaint filed under Sub-section (1) of the Section 18 of the RTI Act. 2005. Brief fact of the case is that the complainant Shri Signal Yirang on 04.07.2024 filed an RTI application in Form-A to the PIO cum EE (PWD) Pasighat Division, East Siang District A.P, whereby, seeking various information as quoted in Form-A application. Complainant being rejected his RTI application, filed this complaint to the Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission on 28.10.2024, and Registry of the Commission (APIC), on receipt of the complaint, registered it as APIC-No. 07/2024 (Complaint) and processed the same for its inquiry / hearing and disposal.

Accordingly, this matter came up for hearing before the Commission for 1 (one) time dated 10/10/2025. In this hearing of the complaint on 10.10.2025, the PIO-Cum- EE (PWD) Pasighat Division East Siang District is represented by Er. Tapang Tatak , AE and the appellant Shri Signal Yirang attended the hearing through VC.

Complaint under Section 18 (1) of RTI has received by this Commission from the appellant Shri Signal Yirang. After going through the complaint, the appellant is alleging the PIO for giving his Phone Number to the Contractor of the Firm. The PIO is connivance with the Contractor of the Firm evaded in furnishing the information.

The appellant stated that the contractor of the firm has called him asking to withdraw any complaint lodged pertaining to the work. The appellant sought relief from the Commission for penalty and disciplinary action against the PIO for the acts he lodged against the PIO.

In the instant case it is Complaint under Section 18 (1) of RTI Act 2005. Under this section the commission shall receive and inquire into a complaint from any person:

- (a) Who has been unable to submit a request to a Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, either by reason that no such officer has been appointed under this Act, or because the Central Assistant Public Information Officer or State Assistant Public Information Officer, as the case may be, has refused to accept his or her application for information or appeal under this Act for forwarding the same to the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer or senior officer specified in sub-section (1) of section 19 or the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, as the case may be;
- (b) Who has been refused access to any information requested under this Act;
- (c) Who has not been given a response to a request for information or access to information within the time limit specified under this Act;
- (d) Who has been required to pay an amount of fee which he or she considers unreasonable;
- (e) Who believes that he or she has been given incomplete, misleading or false information under this Act; and

(f) In respect of any other matter relating to requesting or obtaining access to records under this Act.

The Commission observes that the complaint was filed under Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005 where the Commission was only required to ascertain if the information has been denied with a mala fide intent or due to an unreasonable cause or under any other clause of Section 18 of RTI Act. Since records of the case do not indicate any such deliberate denial or concealment of information on the part of the PIO, the Commission concluded that no cause of action would necessitate under the provisions of the Section 20 (1) of the RTI Act, 2005 in the instant complaint.

Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed.

Judgement / Order pronounced in the Open Court of this Commission today this 10th day of March, 2025. Each copy of the Judgement / Order be furnished to the parties.

Given under my hand and seal of this Commission / Court on this 10th day of March, 2025.

Sd/-
(Khohey Thaley)
State Information Commissioner
APIC, Itanagar

Dated Itanagar the 10th March, 2025.

Memo No. APIC-07/2024/647

Copy to:

1. The PIO-cum-EE(PWD), Pasighat Division, East Siang District, Arunachal Pradesh for information. Pin: 791101
2. Shri Signal Yirang, Tailang Sancha Bhawan, Transport Coloney Road, Polo coloney, Naharlagun, Papum Pare District, Arunachal Pradesh for information. Contact No. 9862367119
3. Computer Programmer, Itanagar, APIC to upload in APIC website and mailed to concerned department email.
4. Office copy

Registrar/Dy. Registrar
APIC, Itanagar
Registrar
Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission
Itanagar.