



**ARUNACHAL PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION  
ITANAGAR**

**BEFORE THE FULL BENCH COURT OF STATE INFORMATION COMMISSIONERS**

No.APIC-1034/2023

Dated, Itanagar the 28<sup>th</sup> May, 2024

**Appeal Under Section 19(3) RTI Act, 2005**

**Appellant:** Shri Dongru Tania, Near Takar Complex, Naharlagun, Po/Ps Naharlagun, Papum Pare District, Arunachal Pradesh, PIN-791110, (M) 7005481022.

Vs

**Respondent:** The PIO-cum- District Disaster Management Officer(DDMO), Govt. of A.P. Department of Disaster Management, Hawaii, Anajw District, Arunachal Pradesh, PIN-792104.

**ORDER**

This is an appeal under Section 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005 filed by Mr. Dongru Tania, Near Takar Complex, Naharlagun, Po/Ps Naharlagun, Papum Pare District, Arunachal Pradesh, for non-furnishing of information by the PIO-cum- District Disaster Management Officer (DDMO), Govt. of A.P. Department of Disaster Management, Hawaii, Anajw District, Arunachal Pradesh, as sought by the Appellant under section 6(1) of RTI Act, 2005 vide Form-A Dated 29/08/2023 regarding Information related to COVID-19 Pandemic of Anjaw District.

The 1<sup>st</sup> hearing is held today on 28<sup>th</sup> May, 2024 as scheduled. Shri SohapsoTayang, the PIO-cum- District Disaster Management Officer(DDMO), Govt. of A.P. Department of Disaster Management, Hawaii, Anajw District, Arunachal Pradesh is present. The Appellant Shri Dongru Tania is absent. The PIO has submitted that Form-A application Dated 29/08/2023 was received by him in the 1<sup>st</sup> week of November, 2023. The information sought by the Applicant is vague and voluminous so could not be furnished within prescribed period.

The PIO has submitted copies of Hearing Notice Memo No. ANJ/GA-0022(RTI)-2021/8300 dated Hawaii, the 6<sup>th</sup> Nov'2023, Hearing Order Memo No. ANJ/GA-0022(RTI)-2022-23/8547-50 dated Hawaii, the 22<sup>nd</sup> Nov'2023 and Hearing Order Memo No. ANJ/GA-0022(RTI)-2022-23/8019 dated Hawaii, the 28<sup>th</sup> Nov'2023 by the First Appellate Authority (FAA) giving him opportunities of being heard.

The Commission going through the records available and submission made by the the PIO, it is found that the information sought are vague and voluminous. The Commission directs the Appellant to seek specific information as given under clause (b) of subsection (1) of the Section (6) of the RTI Act, 2005. Keeping in view not to disproportionately divert the resources of the public authority given under Subsection (9) of section (7) of the RTI Act, the Commission cited the Supreme Court's adjudication in the case of , "CBSE vs Aditya Bandopadhyay&Ors on 9 August, 2011, Civil Appeal No.6454 of 2011",

"37. ....Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counter-productive as it will adversely affect the efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information. The Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the nationaldevelopment and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens. Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties. The threat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of a public authorities prioritising 'information furnishing', at the cost of their normal and regular duties."



Further, the Commission observes that the Appellant did not avail the fair and reasonable opportunities facilitated by the First Appellate Authority (FAA) and also not present in today's hearing summoned by the APIC. So, the Commission in the larger public interest decides to dispose of this appeal case presuming that the Appellant is actually not interested in the information as sought by him.

**Therefore, the case is hereby disposed of.**

**Order copies be issued to all the parties.**

Sd/-

(Rinchen Dorjee)

State Chief Information Commissioner  
Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission

Itanagar

Memo No. APIC-1034/2023/1684

Dated, Itanagar the 30 May, 2024

Copy to:

1. The FAA-cum-Deputy Commissioner, Hawaii, Anjaw District, Arunachal Pradesh, PIN-792104 for information please.
2. Computer Programmer, APIC, Itanagar, to upload in APIC Website & send mail to all the parties.
3. Case file.

Registrar /Dy. Registrar

Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission

Itanagar

Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission  
Itanagar