



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

An apple case U/S 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005

Vide Case No.APIC- 49/2025

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

Shri Riya Taram
Jollang, Itanagar.

Appellant.

-VERSUS-

PIO-cum-DFO, Daporijo Forest Division **Respondent.**

Date of hearing : 07/07/2025
Date of decision/Judgment : 07/07/2025

INFORMATION COMMISSIONER : Shri Khopey Thaley
Relevant facts emerging from Appeal:

RTI application file on : 15/10/2024
PIO replied on :
First appeal file on : 30/11/2024
First Appellate Authority's order :
2nd Appeal dated : 13/01/2025

Information sought :

The appellant file an RTI Application dated 15/10/2024 seeking Details regarding release relevant information against the released of fund amounting to Rs. 451.563 lakhs of LOC for the month of March 2024 to DFO Account for proper implement of the items under CA, WLM & NPA' component of the State CAMPA AOP Vol-I & II during the year 2023-24 uder Department of Environment & Forest & Climate Change.

As per the case record, PIO has never conducted hearing under his jurisdiction.

Being dissatisfied, the appellant filed First Appeal dated 30/11/2024. No any hearing has conducted by the First Appellate Authority in this regard. Feeling aggrieved and dissatisfied, appellant approached the Commission with instant Second Appeal.

The following were present.

Appellant : Shri Riya Taram present in person.

Respondent : PIO-cum-DFO, Daporijo Forest Division found absent.

JUDGEMENT

This is an appeal filed under sub-section (3) of Section 19 of the RTI Act, 2005. Brief fact of the case is that the appellants Shri Riya Taram on 15/10/2024 filed an RTI application under Form-'A' before the PIO-Cum-Divisional Forest Officer, Daporijo Forest Division, Upper Subansiri District, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh whereby, seeking various information,

as quoted in Form-A application. The Appellant, being not satisfied with the information received from the PIO, filed the First Appeal before the First Appellate Authority on **30.11.2024**, Appellant, again having not received the required information from the FAA, filed the Second Appeal before the Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission on **13/01/2025** and the Registry of the Commission (APIC), having receipt of the appeal, registered it as **APIC No. 49/2025** and processed the same for its hearing and disposal.

Accordingly, matter came up for hearing before the Commission for first time i.e on 07/07/2025. In this hearing of the appeal on 7th day of July, 2025, the Appellant Shri Riya Taram present in person but the PIO-cum-DFO, Daporijo Forest Division found absent without any intimation to the Commission. The appellant is directed to file before the F.A.A for the information under Section 6 of RTI Act which he is seeking. The FAA-cum-Chief Conservator of Forest, Central Arunachal Circle, Pasighat, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh and PIO-cum-DFO, Daporijo Forest Division, Upper Subansiri, District is directed to take up case and dispose as per Section-7 of RTI Act, 2005 within 30 days on receipt of the request.

Under Section 19(1) of the Act, the First Appellate Authority (FAA), the intermediate level, has to adjudicate on the Appeal, if any, filed by the information seekers against the decision of the PIO.

As laid down at para-38 of the Guidelines for the FAA issued by the GOI and the State Govt., adjudication on the appeals under the RTI Act is a quasi-judicial function. It is, therefore, necessary that the Appellate Authority should see to it that the justice is not only done but it should also appear to have been done. In order to do so, the order passed by the appellate authority should be a speaking order giving justification for the decision arrived at.

The First Appellate Authority (FAA), following the principle of natural justice, should conduct hearing giving fair and equal opportunity to both the appellant and the PIO and thereafter must pass reasoned and speaking order on merit within 30 days from the date of receipt of the appeal or else the action of the FAA would be considered as procedural lapse on the part of the FAA.

Further, it is noticed that the Appellant in most case do not wait for the orders of the First Appellate Authority (FAA) and directly prefer appeals before the 2nd Appellate Authority without attaching a copy of order passed by the First Appellate Authority (FAA) unintelligently.

Here, it is germane to note that for availing 2nd appeal before the 2nd Appellate Authority, the Appellant has been given 90 days' time from the date of order passed by the First Appellate Authority (FAA). The 2nd appeal, if he/she is dissatisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority (FAA), must be accompanied by the orders passed by the First Appellate Authority (FAA).

The appeal is accordingly remand back to the First Appellate Authority for adjudication and passing an appropriate order who, being the officer senior in rank to the PIO and well versed with the knowledge of the functioning of the department, shall apply his mind and go into the aspects like what kind of information was sought by appellant in his

application, whether the same and could be provided or whether the same is exempted under the relevant provisions of section 8 of the Act or whether the information relates to matter covered by Section 11 of the RTI Act etc. and then pass a speaking order giving justification for his decision within 3 (three) weeks from the date of receipt of this order.

Therefore, perusing the case records, the Commission deemed fit to remand back the appeal case APIC No. 49/2025 to First Appellate Authority for proper hearing. The case is disposed off with liberty to appellant to prefer second appeal if dissatisfied or aggrieved by the decision of the First Appellate Authority for which no fees need be paid.

The Commission found that the hearing case has not been done through proper procedure, I find this appeal fit to be disposed of and closed. And, accordingly, this appeal stands disposed off and remand back to FAA for proper hearing.

Judgment/Order pronounced in the open Court of this Commission today on this 7th day of July, 2025. Each copy of Judgment/Order be furnished to the parties.

Given under my hand and seal of this Commission/Court on this 7th day of July, 2025.

Sd/-
(Khohey Thaley)
State Information Commissioner
APIC, Itanagar.
Dated Itanagar, the 8th July 2025.

Memo.No.APIC-49/2025/ *445*
Copy to:

1. The FAA-cum-Chief Conservator of Forest, Central Arunachal Circle, Pasighat East Siang District, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh for information and necessary action please.
2. The PIO-cum- Divisional Forest Officer, Daporijo Forest Division, Upper Subansiri District, Arunachal Pradesh for information and necessary action please.
3. Shri Riya Taram, Shri Bengia Tahar & Shri Lokam Namdu, Huto Colony Jollang, C/o Riang Store beside Catholic Church, Jollang, Papum Pare District for information & necessary action. **Contact No. 9383103387.**
4. The Computer Programmer for upload on the Website of APIC, please.
5. Office Copy.

Rangishis
Registrar/Dy Registrar
APIC, Itanagar
Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission
Itanagar