



ARUNACHAL PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION

ITANAGAR.

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

Case No. APIC-200/2025.

APPELLANT : Shri Tamchi Gungte KV-2 School Chimpu.
RESPONDENT : The PIO, o/o the Executive Engineer(RWD), Khonsa Division,
Khonsa Division.

ORDER

This is an appeal under Section 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005 received from Shri Tamchi Gungte for non-furnishing of 26(twenty six) point information on the following 5(five) projects under Pradhan Mantri Jan Karyakaram (PMJKV), erstwhile-MsDP Scheme, Ministry of Minority Affairs Govt. of India” during the financial year 2015-16 by the PIO, o/o the Executive Engineer, RWD, Khonsa Division, District : Tirap, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh as sought for by him under section 6(1) (Form-A) of RTI Act, 2005 vide his application dated 11.11.2024:

1. Construction of 50 bedded Girls Hostel with CGI Sheet roofing at Govt. ME School, Chongkhaw in Pongchao-Wakka block of Longding Dist. A.P.
2. Construction of 50 bedded Girls Hoste! with CGI Sheet roofing at Govt. ME School, Khassa in Pongchao-Wakka block of Longding District. A.P;
3. Construction of RCC school building with CGI Sheet roofing at Govt. Primary School, Longding in Niausa block of Longding Dist. A.P.
4. Construction of RCC girls Hostel with CGI Sheet roofing at Govt. ME School, Chanu Village in Niausa block of Longding Dist. A.P.
5. Construction of School building with CGI Sheet roofing at Govt. ME School, Tissa in Niausa block of Longding District A.P.

Hearing and decision:

This appeal was heard 2(two) times earlier on 06.06.2025 and 11.07.2025.

On 06.06.2025 wherein the appellant, Shri Tamchi Gungte and the APIO, Shri Rigi Geyi, Draughtsman-II, representing the PIO, were present, this Commission, upon hearing the parties and on noticing that the documents brought in by the APIO were found not properly indexed, returned the documents to the APIO with advice to get the documents properly indexed and signed by the PIO with seal. This Commission also directed the PIO, EE (RWD), Khonsa Division to collect the documents from the o/o the EE, Longding Division and furnish to the appellant. The EE(RWD), Longding Division was also directed to provide the requested documents to the EE, Khonsa Division as mandated under sub-section(5) of section 5 of the RTI Act so as not to constrain this Commission to take avoidable penal action under the RTI Act.

On 11.07.2025, the PIO, Er. Shri W. Hondique, the EE (RWD), Khonsa Division and the appellant were present in person.

This Commission, on perusal of the replies which the PIO furnished during the hearing most of which had been shown as 'NA', had directed the PIO to furnish the clarification and **with reasons** for the replies 'Not Available' or 'Not Applicable' whichever is the case.

The appellant, vide letter dt. 18.07.2025, had complained that the documents/replies furnished by the PIO are either incomplete or not well defined (specific) as indicated below:

F) Project No. 1 : Construction of 50 bedded Girls Hostel with CGI sheet roofing at Govt. Me School, Chongkhaw in Pongchao-wakka block of Longding Dist. A.P:

Serial No. 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25	The information furnished is not well define and authentic
Sl. No. 10	Scope of work furnished in the DPR but the design is not furnished
Sl. No. 14	Incomplete information
Sl. No. 22	Documents furnished is incomplete as the work order furnished by the PIO against the multiple contractors is 52,78,232 /- whereas the total amount of sanction is 1,15,00,000
Sl. No. 24	The photograph furnished is incomplete
Sl. No. 26	The payment details furnished by the PIO is not the document I seeked, It is just the memorandum of payment documents. It is just the description of how the payment should be made to the contractor and the information is seeking is cheque / DBT details issued in the name of contractor.

G) Project No. 2 : Construction of 50 bedded Girls Hostel with CGI sheet roofing at Govt. ME School, Khassa in Pongchao-wakka block of Longding Dist. A.P:

Sl. No. 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25	The information furnished is not well define and authentic
Sl. no 10	Scope of work furnished in the DPR but the design is not furnished
Sl. No. 14	Incomplete information
Sl. No. 22	Documents furnished is incomplete as the work order furnished by the PIO against the multiple contractors is 6,87,173 /- whereas the total amount of sanction is 1,15,00,000
Sl. No. 24	The photograph furnished is incomplete as per the work item in the DPR
Sl. No. 26	The payment details furnished by the PIO is not the document I seeked, It is just the memorandum of payment documents. It is just the description of how the payment should be made to the contractor and the information is seeking is cheque / DBT details issued in the name of contractor.

H) Project No. 3 : Construction of RCC school building with CGI sheet roofing at Govt. Primary School, Longding Dist:

Sl. No. 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25	The information furnished is not well define and authentic
Sl. No. 5	The PIO furnished incomplete documents, as the sanction amount is 60 lakhs but only 27 lakhs UC is furnished.
Sl No. 10	Scope of work furnished in the DPR but the design is not furnished
Sl. No. 14	Incomplete information furnished.
Sl. No. 22	Did not furnish any document
Sl. No. 24	The photograph furnished is incomplete as per the work item in the DPR
Sl. No. 26	The payment details furnished by the PIO is not the document I seeked, It is just the memorandum of payment documents. It is just the description of how the payment should be made to the contractor and the information is seeking is cheque / DBT details issued in the name of contractor.

I) Project No. 4 : Construction of RCC Girls Hostel with CGI sheet roofing at Govt. ME School, Chanu village in Niauxa block of Longding Dist.

Sl. No. 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25	The information furnished is not well define and authentic
Sl. no 5	The PIO furnished incomplete documents, as the sanction amount is 50 lakhs but only 27 lakhs UC is furnished.
Sl. No. 10	Scope of work furnished in the DPR but the design is not furnished
Sl. No. 14	Incomplete information furnished.
Sl. No. 22	Document furnished is incomplete as the work order furnished by the PIO against the multiple contractors is 23,14,400/- whereas the total amount of sanction is 50,00,000/-
Sl. No. 24	The photograph furnished is incomplete as per the work item in the DPR
Sl. No. 26	The payment details furnished by the PIO is not the document I seeked, It is just the memorandum of payment documents. It is just the description of how the payment should be made to the contractor and the information is seeking is cheque / DBT details issued in the name of contractor.

J) Project No. 5 : Construction of School building with CGI Sheet roofing at Govt. ME School, Tissa in Niauxa block of Longding Dist:

Sl. No. 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 15,16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25	The information furnished is not well define and authentic
Sl. No. 5	The PIO furnished incomplete documents, as the sanction amount is 50 lakhs but only 27 lakhs UC is furnished.
Sl. No. 10	Scope of work furnished in the DPR but the design is not furnished
Sl. No. 14	Incomplete information furnished.
Sl. No. 22	The PIO did not furnish any documents.
Sl. No. 24	The photograph furnished is incomplete as per the work item in the DPR
Sl. No. 26	The payment details furnished by the PIO is not the document I sought, It is just the memorandum of payment documents. It is just the description of how the payment should be made to the contractor and the information is seeking is cheque / DBT details issued in the name of contractor.

This Commission, drawing the attention of the PIO to the provisions of clause (e) under section 18(1) according to which an incomplete, misleading or false information furnished by the PIO is a good ground for imposing penalties, directed him to furnish the requested information correctly and in complete form and report the compliance thereof in the hearing fixed today on 05.09.2025.

Today on 05.09.2025 the APIO, Shri Rigi Geyi brought in the left out information which have been handed over to the appellant, Shri Tamchi Gungte who shall go through the same and report his satisfaction or otherwise therewith within one week from today for further consideration of this Commission.

Given under my hand and seal of this Commission on this 5th Sept., 2025.

Sd/-

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

Memo No. APIC- 200/2025 / 620 Dated Itanagar, the 5th Sept., 2025

Copy to:

1. The Chief Engineer (RWD), (E/Z), Itanagar, Govt. of A.P, First Appellate Authority (FAA), for information.
2. The PIO o/o the Executive Engineer, RWD, Khonsa Division, Dist :Tirap Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh for information.
3. The E.E(RWD), Longding Division, District Longding, A.P for information and compliance.
4. Shri Tamchi Gungte, near KV-II School Chimpu, Po/PS Chimpu, DistPapum Pare, 791113, A.P. Mobile No. 9233567279.
- ✓ 5. The Computer Programmer/Computer Operator for uploading on the Website of APIC, please.
6. Office copy.
7. S/Copy.

P. Raju
Registrar/ Deputy Registrar
APIC, Itanagar.
Deputy Registrar
Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission
Itanagar