



**ARUNACHAL PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION  
ITANAGAR.**

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

**Case No. APIC- 696/2025.**

**APPELLANTS  
RESPONDENT**

: Shri Biru Natung, Ziro Point Itanagar.

: The PIO, o/o the Arunachal Public Service Commission (APPSC), Itanagar.

**ORDER**

This is an appeal under Section 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005 received from Shri Biru Natung for non-furnishing of below mentioned information by the PIO, o/o the Arunachal Public Service Commission (APPSC), Itanagar as sought for by him under section 6(1) (Form-A) of RTI Act, 2005 vide his application dated 25.04.2025:

**A.Particular of information:** Recruitment test of Viva marks

**B.Details of information required:**

- DIET Lecturer Recruitment of Viva marks,
- Roll No. 100234,
- Pedagogy of Hindi,
- DIET Lecturer Viva marks of parameters/criteria.

**Brief facts emerging from the appeal :**

Records emerging from the appeal disclose that the Appellant, Shri Biru Natung had requested the PIO for the aforementioned information / documents but failed to obtain the same which prompted him to appeal before the, Arunachal Pradesh Public Service Commission (APPSC), Itanagar as the First Appellate Authority (FAA) under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act vide his appeal Memo dated 05.06.2025. But having failed to obtain any response from the PIO or the FAA the appellant filed his 2<sup>nd</sup> appeal before this Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act vide Memo of appeal dt. 03.09.2025

This appeal was heard on 03.12.2025, wherein Ms. Taya Yullu, Under Secretary-cum-APIO, APPSC and the appellant, Shri Biru Natung were present in person.

This Commission, upon hearing the parties, noticed that the limited question for consideration in the appeal was as to whether the marks awarded by the Interview Board members as per the parameter/criteria adopted could be disclosed or are exempted under section 8(1) of the RTI Act 2005. This Commission, after hearing the parties, then passed the following order:

“In adverting to the question, this Commission deems it appropriate and relevant to refer to the Hon’ble Supreme Court ruling as contained in para 28 of its judgement dt.09.08.2011 in Civil Appeal No.6454 of 2011 (arising out of SLP (c) No.7526/2009) (Central Board of School Education & ors. Vs. Aditya Bandopadhyya & ors. which is extracted hereunder:

“ 28. When an examining body engages the services of an examiner to evaluate the answer-books, the examining body expects the examiner not to disclose the information regarding evaluation to anyone other than the examining body. Similarly the examiner also expects that his name and particulars would not be disclosed to the candidates whose answer-books are evaluated by him.

*In the event of such information being made known, a disgruntled examinee who is not satisfied with the evaluation of the answer books, may act to the prejudice of the examiner by attempting to endanger his physical safety. Further, any apprehension on the part of the examiner that there may be danger to his physical safety, if his identity becomes known to the examinees, may come in the way of effective discharge of his duties.*

*The above applies not only to the examiner, but also to the scrutiniser, co-ordinator, and head-examiner who deal with the answer book. The answer book usually contains not only the signature and code number of the examiner, but also the signatures and code number of the scrutinizer / coordinator/head examiner. The information as to the names or particulars of the examiners /co-ordinators / scrutinisers / head examiners are therefore exempted from disclosure under section 8(1) (g) of RTI Act. on the ground that if such information is disclosed it may endanger their physical safety. Therefore, if the examinees are to be given access to evaluated answer-books either by permitting inspection or by granting certified copies, such access will have to be given only to that part of the answer-book which does not contain any information or signature of the examiners/coordinators/scrutinisers / head examiners, exempted from disclosure under section 8(1)g) of RTI Act. Those portions of the answer-books which contain information regarding the examiners /co-ordinators / scrutinisers /head examiners or which may disclose their identity with reference to signature or initials, shall have to be removed, covered, or otherwise severed from the non-exempted part of the answer-books, under section 10 of RTI Act."*

The ratio of the above Apex Court judgement have consistently been followed by the Hon'ble Court in number of its later judgements, one of which is ***Bihar Public Service Commission Vs. Saiyed Hussain Abbas & Anr.*** in 2012.

This Commission, in the light of the principle of law settled by the Apex Court as above, holds that the marks scored by the appellant as per the parameter/criteria ***minus*** the names of the members of Interview Board can be furnished. And as such, the PIO is directed to furnish the same to the appellant, accordingly, within 1(one)month from the date of receipt of this order and report compliance thereof to this Commission on 23<sup>rd</sup> January, 2026. It is, however, made clear that if the Commission/Interview Board did not follow any parameter/criteria of awarding the viva-voce marks, then the PIO shall declare so by way of an affidavit as mandated by law under section-18(3)(c) and rule-5(vi) of the A.P Information Commission (Appeal Procedure) Rules, 2005."

Today on 23.01.2026, the appellant, Shri Biru Natung is present in person but the PIO is absent.

Heard the appellant who submitted that he has received the sought for information from the PIO. He also produced a copy of letter dt.21.01.2026 from the APIO, Ms. Taya Yullu by which the parameter-wise marks obtained by the appellant has been furnished to the appellant.

This Commission perused the requested reply/information so furnished by the o/o the PIO and concludes that the order of this Commission has been complied with by the o/o the PIO and resultantly, this appeal does not warrant any further adjudication in this Commission and accordingly, stands disposed of and closed.



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

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

Memo No. APIC-696/2025/1051 Dated Itanagar, the 28 Jan., 2026

Copy to:

1. The First Appellate Authority (FAA), Arunachal Pradesh Public Service Commission (APPSC), Itanagar for information.
2. The PIO, o/o the Arunachal Pradesh Public Service Commission (APPSC), Itanagar for information.
3. Shri Biru Natung, Ziro Point Itanagar Contact No. 7638915402 for information.
- ✓ 4. The Computer Programmer/Computer Operator for uploading on the website of APIC, please.
5. Office Copy.
6. S/Copy.

*P. Nagaraj*  
Registrar/ Deputy Registrar  
APIC, Itanagar.

Deputy Registrar  
Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission  
Itanagar