



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

An appeal case U/S 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005  
Vide Case No.APIC-69/2020

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE COURT OF SHRI GOTO ETE, THE STATE INFORMATION**  
**COMMISSIONER, UNDER SECTION 19(3) OF RTI ACT, 2005.**

**(Appeal)**

Shri Tadar Takang  
Yawn Colony, Naharlagun  
PO/PS Naharlagun, P/Pare Distt.  
Arunachal Pradesh.

**V/S-**

Er. T.K Tagin  
PIO-cum-SE, (Co-ordination) RWD Itanagar  
Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh.

**JUDGMENT/ORDER**

This is a second appeal under Form-E of the RTI Act filed by Shri Tadar Takang against the PIO, wherein, alleging that PIO-cum-SE, (Co-ord) RWD, Itanagar, Papumpare District, Arunachal Pradesh has refused him to furnish information sought by him under RTI Act. The appeal, having been received in the Commission, has been registered on 17.03.2020, vide No.APIC-69/2020.

Brief fact of the case is that the appellant filed an application to the PIO under Form-A of the RTI Act on 01.11.2019, whereby, seeking information which are as quoted: "***Details information of Appointment order of JE/Surveyor/UDC/LDC/MTS/Peon/Contingency High/Semi Scale Labour from 2017 to 2019***".

Today is the third hearing of this appeal before the Commission. The appellant Shri Tadar Takang is present in person. PIO-cum-SE, (Co-ord) RWD, Itanagar, is also present before the Commission through video conferencing.

Heard both parties. During previous hearing of the appeal on 08.05.2020 the PIO was directed to furnish the information so sought to the appellant. But the appellant now informs the Commission that he has not yet been furnished the information. The PIO, on his part, also admitted to have not furnished the information to the appellant on a plea that the same information which had earlier repeatedly been sought by various other applicants had already been furnished. PIO has also clearly disclosed in his replies to the Show Cause that he had rejected the application of the appellant on the ground that the same documents had been repeatedly issued to all applicants. However, the PIO had not been denial of the fact



that the appellant had not been one among those applicants to whom he had furnished the information so sought by the appellant.

Upon hearing the both parties and also after having careful consideration of the available materials on record including his replies to the Show Cause, I am not satisfied with the replies of Show Cause furnished to the Commission by the Respondent, in as much as, he has not made any replies to the specific allegation made against him of having violation the provisions of sub-section (1) of Section – 7. Those apart, the contents of his replies to the Show Cause clearly establish the fact about his refusal to furnish the information so sought to the appellant unto this date of furnishing his replies to the Show Cause. In the light of facts and circumstances as aforesaid I have no escape from concluding that he (PIO) is liable, among others, for imposing reasonable penalty upon him under sub-section (1) of Section-20 of the RTI Act. And, accordingly, it is ordered as follows:

1. PIO shall pay a penalty amount of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) only, for his violation of sub-section(1) of Section-7 of the RTI Act, 2005. This fine amount shall be deposited in 'Challan Form' in the account of the Registrar APIC, against Head of Account No. 0070 within 30 days for the receipt of a copy of this order.
2. He shall further pay a nominal amount of Rs. 2,000/- (Rupees Two Thousand) only, to the appellant being compensation to be paid to the appellant. This compensation amount shall be paid by him to the appellant in the mode convenient to him within 30 days from the receipt of a copy of this order.
3. The PIO shall again remain present before the Commission on the next date of hearing fixed on 23<sup>rd</sup> day of July, 2020 for any further order or for final disposal of the appeal.
4. PIO shall furnish all the information sought to the appellant within a period of 15 days from today.
5. In the event of his failure to comply with all or any of the order aforesaid may liable him for initiating appropriate action in term of the provision as provided sub-section (2) of Section- 20 of the RTI Act.

In the result this appeal stands disposed off. Judgment/Order pronounced in the open Court of this Commission today on this 25<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2020. Each copy of Judgment/Order be furnished to the parties.

Given under my hand and seal of this Commission/Court on this 25<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2020.

Sd/-  
(Goto Ete)  
State Information Commissioner  
APIC, Itanagar.