



**ARUNACHAL PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION, (APIC)  
ITANAGAR, ARUNACHAL PRADESH**

An appeal case U/S 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005  
Vide Case No. APIC-75/2024

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE COURT OF SHRI VIJAY TARAM, THE STATE INFORMATION  
COMMISSIONER, UNDER SECTION 19(3) OF RTI ACT, 2005.**

Shri Rajesh Paron, Shri Kamin Ejing  
& Shri Rumbo Apang

..... **Appellant.**

**-VERSUS-**

The PIO-cum EE (Electrical)|  
Department, Yingkiong Division,  
U/Siang District, Govt, of Arunachal Pradesh

..... **Respondent.**

**Judgment/Order: 08.08.2024.**

**JUDGMENT/ORDER**

This is an appeal filed under sub-section (3) of Section 19 of the RTI Act, 2005. Brief fact of the case is that the Appellants Shri Rajesh Paron on 17/08/2023 filed an RTI application under Form-'A' before the PIO-Cum-EE Department of (Elect.) Yingkiong Division under West Siang District, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh whereby, seeking various information, as quoted in Form-A application. The Appellants, being not satisfied with the information received from the PIO, filed the First Appeal before the First Appellate Authority (FAA) on 18.09.2023 the Appellants, again having not received the required information(s) from the FAA, filed the Second Appeal before the Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission on 08.12.2023 and the Registry of the Commission (APIC), having receipt of the Appeal registered it as **APIC No. 75/2024** and processed the same for its hearing and disposal.

Accordingly, matter came up for hearing before the Commission for three times i.e on **0/04/2024, 13/06/2024 & 08/08/2024**. In this hearing of the appeal on 8<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2024. The Appellant Shri Rajesh Paron present during the hearing and the PIO heard through whatsapp via video call.

Heard the both the parties.

The PIO stated that the Appellants have already got the information(s) through RTI but, they are seeking for only site verification of the works.

The Appellant also admitted that they have received all the information(s) but in this present appeal they wants to inspect the site for verification whether the work is completely done or not.

After hearing both the parties, the Commission explain the Appellant that;

- (i) According to the High Court of Delhi, through learned judge, Justice Yashwant Varma in the case of Veena Joshi -VS- CPIO, Central Information Commission & ORS. (W.P.(C) 3883/2022) held that right to 'Inspection Of Work' of any Public Authority under Section 2(j) of RTI Act does not include 'Inspection Of Property'

**BRIEF FACTS:** This writ petition was filed against the order of 28 September 2021 in terms of which an application made by the petitioner purporting to invoke the provisions of the Right to Information Act, 2005 was rejected. From a perusal of the application as tendered, it transpires that the petitioner was essentially aggrieved by non-completion of certain civil works in a government quarter which had been allotted to him. It was in that connection that the provisions of the Act were sought to be invoked. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the inspection of premises and properties would fall within the ambit of the Act in light of the provisions made in Section 2(j). According to learned counsel, the use of the word "work" in Section 2(j) would indicate that the provisions of the Act could extend to the prayers as made and laid before the respondents.

**FINDINGS OF THE COURT:** In the considered opinion of the Court that the submissions of the learned counsel of the petitioner was thoroughly misconceived for certain reasons. The court remarked "The Act essentially confers a right on citizens to seek information. It enables them to secure information that may be within the control and possession of public authorities. When Section 2(j) uses *the word "work", it is referring to the inspection of documents and records and it is in that light that the said phrase is liable to be understood. The word "work" is to be read in conjunction with the expressions "documents" and "records"*. It thus must necessarily draw color there from". The court dismissed the petition by remarking that as it construed the provisions of the Act, it was manifest that the application that was made was thoroughly misconceived" (sic).

In light of the above judgment of the Delhi High Court the Commission in Concomitant with the orders came to the decision and ordered;

(i) That the request for site visit of the work cannot be granted to the Appellants.

After hearing the Commission, the Appellant Shri Rajesh Paron understood the matter and has requested the Commission for disposal/closure of their appeal on ground of satisfactorily judgment order pronounced in the Court of the Commission.

In view of the above facts and circumstances I find this appeal fit to be disposed and closed. And, accordingly, this appeal stands disposed and closed once for all.

Judgment/Order pronounced in the open Court of this Commission today on this **8<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2024**. Copy of Judgment/Order be furnished to the parties.

Given under my hand and seal of this Commission/Court on this **8<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2024**.

Sd/-  
(Vijay Taram)  
State Information Commissioner  
APIC, Itanagar.

Memo No APIC- 75/2024 / 356  
Copy to :-

Dated Itanagar 27 September 2024.

1. The PIO-cum EE (Electrical) Department, Yingkiong Division, U/Siang District, Govt, of Arunachal Pradesh, for information and necessary action please. **Pin Code- 791002.**
2. Shri Rajesh Paron, Kameng Ejing & Shri Rumbo Apang, C/o JNC, PO-Hilltop, Pasighat, E/Siang District, for information please. **Contact no. 8974920552**
3. The Computer Operator, for uploading on the website of APIC, please.
4. Office Copy.

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