



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

Appeal U/S 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005
vide No.APIC-166/2019

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE COURT OF SHRI GOTO ETE, THE STATE
INFORMATION COMMISSIONER:**

Shri Tarh Gobin
G-Extension, PO/PS: Naharlagun.
C/O Apatani Food Restaurant,
G-Extension, Nlg, Arunachal Pradesh Appellant

-VERSUS -

Shri Nangram Pinkap
PIO-cum-State Project Director (ISSE)
Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh, Itanagar,
Arunachal Pradesh..... Respondent

Date of judgment/order: 26.11.2020

ORDER

This is a Second Appeal filed under sub-section (3) of Section-19 of the RTI Act, 2005. Brief fact of the case is that the appellant filed an RTI application under Form-A before the PIO on 06.09.2019, whereby, seeking for information regarding the management costs distributed in various Districts of Arunachal Pradesh. The appellant, having not received any response from the PIO, filed the First Appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 21.10.2019. Being aggrieved by having not received any response from the First Appellate Authority, the appellant filed this Second Appeal before the Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission and the Registry of the Commission, having receipt of the same, registered it as APIC No.166/2019. And, hence, the case.

The appeal earlier came up for hearing before the Commission on 5(five) consecutive dates, i.e, on 08.01.2020, 12.02.2020, 11.03.2020, 04.06.2020, 25.06.2020. During pending proceeding of the appeal a show cause notice was also issued against the PIO on 20th May, 2020 as to why he should not be imposed a reasonable penalty for his refusal or neglect in furnishing the information sought to the appellant within prescribed period of 30 days as provided under sub-section (1) Of Section-7 of the RTI Act, 2005. The PIO, whereupon, furnished his written replies to the show cause notice before the Commission on 24.06.2020.

Finally, the appeal along with the matter relating the show cause notice issued against the PIO has come up today before the Commission for hearing. Appellant Shri Tarh Gobin is present through audio/video conferencing and the PIO-cum-State Project Director (ISSE) Shri Nangram Pinkap is also present in person before the Commission. During the hearing the PIO revealed both in his verbal