



ARUNACHAL PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION ITANAGAR.

An Appeal Case U/S 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005

Case No. APIC-606/2025.

**APPELLANT
RESPONDENT**

: Shri Ganpho Khusumchai, Longding.
: The PIO, o/o the E.E (PWD), Longding, Longding
District (A.P)

ORDER

This is an appeal under Section 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005 received from Shri Ganpho Khusumchai for non-furnishing of 15 point information on Creation of Barrier free Environment in 18 State Govt. Buildings in Longding by the PIO, o/o the E.E (PWD), Longding, Longding District (A.P) as sought for by him under section 6(1) (Form-A) of RTI Act, 2005 vide his application dated 06.05.2025.

A. Particular of information:Creation of Barrier free Environment in 18 State Govt. Buildings in Longding.

B. Details of information required:

1. Certified copy of DPR.
2. Certified copy of total amount against scheme.
3. Certified copy of work order.
4. Certified copy of Sanction release order.
5. Certified copy of payment details.
6. Certified copy of name of the contractor or firm.
7. Certified copy of completion certificate.
8. Certified copy of utilization certificate.
9. Certified copy of HD photograph with geo tag record of before and after.
10. Certified copy of mandatory certificate on deduction of VAT.
11. Certified copy of geo tag certificate submission for the approval of Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh.
12. Certified copy of tender advertisement.
13. Certified copy of letter of credit.
14. Certified copy of 18 buildings for creation of barrier free at longding district.
15. Certified copy of charter audit reports.

C) Period for which information is sought for: 2021 to 2022.

Facts emerging from the appeal:

Records reveal that the appellant had requested the PIO for the aforementioned information but could not obtain the same which prompted him to approach the CE(PWD) (Eastern Zone), Namsai, the First Appellate Authority (FAA) under section 19(1) of the RTI Act vide his memo of appeal dt.20.06.2025. But having failed yet again to receive any response from the PIO or from the FAA, he filed his 2nd appeal before this Commission under section 19(3) of the RTI Act vide his memo of appeal dt. 01.08.2025.

The records also reveal that the PIO, vide his letter dt.21.07.2025, had furnished the information but the appellant is not satisfied on the ground that the documents/information are incomplete. As such, he preferred this second appeal.

Today on 23.01.2026, Er. Shri Dongda Taduk, AE-cum-the APIO is present in person who submitted that the information/replies as directed by this Commission's order dt.25.11.2025 has been provided to the appellant. The appellant is absent also informed and acknowledged through mobile phone during the course of hearing that the PIO has furnished the information/replies and accordingly desired that the appeal be disposed of and closed.

In the premises as above, this appeal stands disposed of and closed.

Given under my hand and seal of this Commission on this 23rd Jan.,2026.

Sd/-
(S. TSERING BAPPU)
State Information Commissioner,
APIC, Itanagar.

Memo No. APIC- 606/2025 /1053

Dated Itanagar, the 28 Jan.,2026

Copy to:

1. The Chief Engineer (PWD), Easter Zone Namsai PIN: 792103 for information.
2. The PIO, o/o the Executive Engineer (PWD) Longding, Longding District PIN:792131 for information.
3. Shri Ganpho Khusumchai, Longding, Longding District (A.P) PIN: 792131 Mobile No.8730850238 for information.
4. The Computer Programmer/Computer Operator for uploading on the Website of APIC, please.
5. Office copy.
6. S/Copy.

Pcay 29/01/26
Registrar/ Deputy Registrar
APIC, Itanagar.

Deputy Registrar
Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission
Itanagar

Hearing and decision:

This appeal was heard for 2(two) times on 03.10.2025 and 07.11.2025.

On 03.10.2025, the PIO was absent but the appellant, Shri Ganpho Khusumchai was present in person who submitted that in response to his RTI application, the PIO has furnished some documents/information but did not furnish the following information:

- 1.DPR (Sl. No. 1 of RTI application);
- 2.Certificate copy of work order (Sl. No.3 of application) (Reason not given);
- 3.Sanction order copy (Sl. No.4);
- 4.Payment details (Sl.No.5);
- 5.Photograph with geo tag record (Sl. No.9) (Photo not satisfactory);
- 6.C.A Report (Sl. No.15) (Reason not given)

The PIO was, therefore, directed vide order dt.06.10.2025, to furnish the requested information/documents as per the RTI application and report compliance on 07.11.2025.

In compliance with the aforesaid order of this Commission, the PIO's representative, Er. Shri Pratik Kumar, J.E was present on 07.11.2025 with the left out documents which were handed over to the appellant, Shri Ganpho Khusumchai. However, on perusal of the documents, the following shortcomings were noticed in the documents:

- a)The copy of DPR was not properly certified;
- b)The copy of work order was not furnished;
- c)The copies of payment details were not legible and lacked signature and seal of the PIO in some of the pages;
- d)The details of longitude and latitude in the geo tag photographs were not visible.

The PIO was, therefore, again directed to get the documents properly certified by the PIO or the APIO and furnish to the appellant. The PIO was also directed to furnish the *copy of agreement executed with the contractor in lieu of the copy work order.*

As regards the CA report, the representative of the PIO submitted that since the work is still ongoing, no audit has been conducted as yet.

The o/o PIO was, thus directed to comply with the above direction within 1(one) week from 10.11.2025 with intimation to this Commission and the appellant was also directed to report his satisfaction or otherwise therewith to this Commission within 1(one) week thereafter.

As directed, the appellant, through his whatsapp messege on 24.11.2025 complained that the PIO did not comply with the order of this Commission. As such this appeal has been listed again today on 23.01.2026 with direction to the PIO to furnish the left out information/documents and report the compliance thereof so as not to constrain this Commission to invoke the penal provisions of RTI Act. It was also made clear in the order that if the o/o the PIO does not hold the requested information, then he shall furnish and affidavit to that effect as required by law under section section-18(3)(c) and under rule- 5(vi) of the AP Information Commission (Appeal Procedure) Rules, 2005.