



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

Appeal U/S 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005
vide No.APIC-46/2020

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

Shri Ragi Neri
Pacha Morang New Seppa
East Kameng District A.Pradesh Appellant

- VERSUS -

Er. Taru Dok
PIO-cum-EE, RWD,
Longding Dist. A.Pradesh Respondent

Date of judgment/order: **27.08.2020**

JUDGMENT/ORDER

Brief fact of the case being that the above named appellant on 22.07.2019 filed an RTI application under Form-A, seeking various information regarding construction of Suspension Bridge over Pachuk River between Talo village to Bameng HQ. The PIO named above, having receipt of the same, furnished an acknowledgement letter to the appellant on the same date of receiving of the application on 22.07.2019.

The appellant, having not received any information from the PIO, filed the First Appeal before the FAA-cum-Superintendent of Engineering, RWD, Rupa, on 17.10.2019 and the FAA, whereupon, vide letter No.RWC/R/RTI-29/Seppa/2014-15/ dated-17.10.2010 requested the PIO to furnish the information sought to the appellant within 7(seven) days from receipt of the letter. In the meantime, the PIO receiving the RTI application, against whom a show cause notice has now been issued, was transferred out from this establishment and Mr. Ronya the PIO-cum-EE succeeding the said previous PIO complied with the direction of the First Appellate Authority in furnishing the information so sought to the appellant vide his letter No.RWD/EK/PMGSY(PIU-H) RTI-20/2019-20 dated-11.11.2019. Appellant again, not being satisfied with the information received from the succeeding PIO, filed the present Second Appeal on the ground of furnishing in-complete information. Having receipt of the appeal the Registry of the Commission registered the appeal, being No.APIC-46/2020, and processed the same to the Commission for hearing and disposal.

Accordingly, the appeal came up for hearing for the first time before the Commission on 02.07.2020 and during which the appellant was present in person while the PIO succeeding the previous PIO was also present through video conferencing. During the course of hearing a prima-facie case was found well established against the previous PIO of having failed to furnish the information