



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

Appeal U/S 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005
Vide No.APIC-26/2020.

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

Shri Vinod Kumar Yadav
Village Siswa, Bhatni
PS-Bhatni Teshil District
Deoria, Uttar Pradesh **Appellant.**

-VERSUS-

Shri Kata Rangmo
The PIO-cum-DDSE,
East Kameng District, Seppa,
Arunahal Pradesh **Respondent.**

Judgment/Order: **20.08.2020.**

JUDGMENT/ORDER

This is an appeal filed under sub-section (3) of Section- 19 of the RTI Act. Brief fact of the case is that the appellant named above Shri Vinod Kumar Yadav filed an on-line RTI application from Uttar Pradesh on 12.05.2018 before the PIO-cum-DDSE, Seppa, seeking some information regarding names, designation, including other details of some teachers of the Middle School Co-operative Line, Seppa, East Kameng District, Arunachal Pradesh. Having not received any response from the PIO he again registered an on-line First Appeal on 26.06.2018 and, thereafter, on 04.06.2019 filed the Second Appeal before the Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission through registered post. Registry of the APIC accordingly registered the appeal vide APIC- 26/2020 and processed to the Commission for hearing and disposal.

Accordingly, this appeal has come up for the first time for hearing today. Appellant Shri Vinod Kumar Yadav and the PIO Mr. Kata Rangmo are both present in person through video conferencing and being heard. Appellant contended that his RTI application had not been responded by the PIO and for which he registered an on-line First Appeal in a prescribed format and thereafter he got a response from the Central Information Commission to approach the Information Commission of the State of Arunachal Pradesh. He has, as such, approached this Commission, being the present appeal. The PIO, on his part, submitted that on receipt of the RTI application of the appellant he sent the information sought to the appellant in his given postal address but on enquiry over phone the appellant informed him to have not received the information. And he, then, asked the appellant about his e-mail address and re-sent the information sought in his given e-mail address vide vk02584@gmail.com. PIO further submitted that he does not have any problem for