



**ARUNACHAL PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION
ITANAGAR**

BEFORE THE COURT OF DR.JORAM BEGI, STATE CHIEF INFORMATION COMMISSIONER

No.APIC-130/2020

Dated, Itanagar the 9th February'2021

Under Section 19(3) RTI Act, 2005

Appellant

**Shri Mikre Taso,
Upper Colony, Likabali,
Lower Siang District,
Arunachal Pradesh.
(m) 6909975426,**

&

Shri Karba Riba

Respondent

**Shri Bajum Taba,
The PIO-cum-DFO,
O/o Divisional Forest Officer,
Likabali,
Lower Siang District,
Arunachal Pradesh.**

Vs

Dated of hearing held on : 9th February' 2021.

ORDER

Whereas, an appeal under Section 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005 has been received from Shri Mikre Taso, Upper Colony, Likabali, Lower Siang District, Arunachal Pradesh, & Shri Karba Riba for non-furnishing of information, by Shri Bajum Taba, the PIO-cum-DFO, O/o Divisional Forest Officer, Likabali, Lower Siang District, Arunachal Pradesh, as sought, by the Appellants under section 6(1) of RTI Act, 2005 on 20/07/2020.

Whereas, the 1st hearing was held through online video / audio conference on 17th November'2020. Shri Bajum Taba, The PIO-cum-DFO, O/o Divisional Forest Officer, Likabali, Lower Siang District, Arunachal Pradesh, and the Appellants Shri Mikre Taso, & Shri Karba Riba, Upper Colony, Likabali, Lower Siang District, Arunachal Pradesh, appeared in the hearing through video conferencing. The Appellant Shri Mikre Taso informed the Commission that the PIO has furnished incomplete and misleading information to them. The PIO refuted and informed the Commission that the information sought by the Appellants regarding the Projects were executed departmentally with the approval from the authority. So, the information as sought by them in the Form A does not arise.

Whereas, the Commission hearing the arguments of both the parties and going through the details of information sought by the Appellant in the Form-A, directed the PIO to furnish all the information to the Appellant which are available in records. The information which does not arise or the information not available in records has to be given in writing to the Appellant. The PIO has to clearly give replies serially as sought in the Form-A by the Appellant.

The Commission, with a caution directed the PIO to furnish all the authenticated information as directed above to the Appellant free of cost on or before 5th December'2020, and the PIO has to ensure that the information actually received by the Appellant, *failing which u/s 20(1) of the RTI Act 2005, penalty of Rs. 25, 000/- (Rupees twenty five thousand) only shall be imposed on the PIO. Also, u/s 20(2) disciplinary action shall be recommended to the Chief Secretary, Govt. of A.P.* The Commission asked the Appellant to receive information from the PIO and convey his satisfaction or dissatisfaction before the next date of hearing.

Whereas, the 2nd hearing was held through online video / audio conference on 8th December'2020. Shri Bajum Taba, the PIO-cum-DFO, O/o Divisional Forest Officer, Likabali, Lower Siang District, Arunachal Pradesh, and the Appellants Shri Mikre Taso, & Shri Karba Riba, Upper Colony, Likabali, Lower Siang District, Arunachal Pradesh, appeared in the hearing through video conferencing. The PIO informed the Commission that all the information has been furnished to the Appellant as directed by the Commission in the last hearing. The Appellant, Shri Mikre Taso informed that the PIO has furnished incomplete information for Sl.no. i, ii, iii, & ix as sought in the Form-A.

Whereas, the Commission on cross examination found that all the information has been furnished to the Appellant by the PIO. However, regarding the information sought at Sl.no. ix. *i.e. Geo-Tagging details of all the mentioned project*, the Commission directed the PIO to bring all the Geo-Tagging details of the projects in the next date of hearing for clarifying the quarries of the Appellants.

Whereas, the 3rd hearing was held on 12th January'2021. Shri Bajum Taba, PIO-cum-DFO, Likabali, Lower Siang District, Arunachal Pradesh, along with Adv. Lizer Bui, the Appellants Shri Mikre Taso and Shri Karba Riba were present during the hearing. The Appellant Shri Mikre Taso inform the Commission that the PIO has not furnished information for the Sl.no. ii, *i.e. money receipt of the Supervisor, Plantation watcher and paid labour*. The PIO has furnished only bill for the paid labour. The Appellant also informed that the PIO has not furnished complete and proper information for Sl.no. ix, *i.e. Geo-tagging details of all the mentioned projects*. The PIO explained that the information furnished for Sl.no. ii is bill and money receipts, the signature and thumb impression of all the paid labour has been taken in it. Regarding Sl.no ix, *i.e. Geo-tagging* the PIO informed that there are so many projects for various areas therefore, only one Geo-tagging is taken for a project and place. The monitoring team monitors the works by that particular single Geo-tagging for a project and reports.

Whereas, the Commission after hearing arguments of both the parties and cross examining the information found that the money receipt of Supervisor and Plant watcher has not been furnished. The information for the money receipt of the paid labour and Geo-tagging is satisfactory. So, the Commission directed the PIO to furnish information for Sl.no. ii, *i.e. money receipt of Supervisor and Plant watcher* before 15th January'2021. The Commission asked the Appellant to receive the information go through and convey his satisfaction or dissatisfaction in the next date of hearing.