



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

Appeal U/S 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005
vide No.APIC-57/2020

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

Shri Tafang Veo
Boso Colony, Seppa,
East Kameng District,
Arunachal Pradesh Appellant

-VERSUS -

Er. M. Ronya, PIO-cum-EE,
RWD, Bameng Division,
East Kameng District
Arunachal Pradesh..... Respondent

Date of judgment/order: 12.11.2020

ORDER

Brief fact of the case is that the appellant on 30.10.2019 filed an RTI application under Form-A before the PIO-cum-EE, RWD, Bameng Division, whereby, seeking various information regarding the PMGSY road construction from Sawa to Venia for the period from 2018-2019. The PIO, having receipt of the RTI application, responded to the appellant vide his letter No.RWD/EK/PMGSY(PIU-II)RTI-28/2018-19 dated-03.12.2019 to the effect that the related documents of the information sought against the items from Sl. No. 1 to 6 have been enclosed. The appellant, being not satisfied with the responses received from the PIO, filed the First Appeal on 31.12.2019 before the FAA-cum-SE, RWD, Rupa Circle, on grounds of furnishing of misleading information including for non-furnishing of the information sought against item Nos. 1, 2 & 3 of his application Form-A. The appellant, having not received any response from the said First Appellate Authority, filed the Second Appeal before the Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission on 19.02.2020, being the present appeal, vide APIC No.57/2020.

Hearing of the appeal has come up today for the first time before the Commission. Appellant Shri Tafang Veo is, though not present, represented by his learned counsel Mr. Tsanpa Tsering (Advocate) through audio/video conferencing. PIO-cum EE, RWD, Bameng Division Er. M. Ronya is also present through audio/video conferencing. Both the parties being heard and the available materials on records also being carefully perused. During the course of hearing the appellant admitted to have received the information sought against item No.4, 5 & 6 from the PIO but denied to have received any of the information sought in item No. 1, 2 & 3 which led him for filing the First Appeal. And, having