सूचना का अधिकार
RIGHT TO INFORMATION

ARUNACHAL PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION, APIC
ITANAGAR

An appeal case U/S 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005
Vide Case No. Appeal -272/A/2025

BEFORE THE COURT OF SHRI KHOPEY THALEY, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER

Shri Vijay Pertin & Kalom Perme..... Appellant

Versus

PIO-cum-SDO, Tezu,
Lohit District Respondent

Date of hearing : 10/09/2025
Date of decision/Judgment : 10/09/2025

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

RTI application file on	:	12/11/2024
PIO replied on	:	
First appeal file on	:	06/12/2024
First Appellate Authority's order	:	
2nd Appeal dated	:	10/03/2025

Information sought :

The appellant file an RTI Application dated 12/11/2024 seeking information regarding Scheduled Tribe Certificate and Permanent Resident Certificate of Shri Chowna Mein.

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

Being dissatisfied, the appellant filed First Appeal dated 06/12/2024. 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 Vijay Pertin present in person.

Respondent : PIO-cum-ADC, Namsai attended through VC.

JUDGEMENT ORDER

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 Vijay Pertin & Shri Kalom Perme **12.11.2024** filed an RTI application under Form-'A' before the PIO-cum-ADC, Namsai, District Namsai, 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 06.**12.2024**, Appellant, again having not received the required information from the FAA, filed the Second Appeal before the Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission on 10.**03.2025** and the Registry of the Commission (APIC), having receipt of the appeal, registered it as **APIC No.272/A/2025** and processed the same for its hearing and disposal.

As per the order given by the First Appellate Authority-cum-DC Namsai, dated 08/02/2025, stating that the documents sought by the appellant falls under the purview of exempted category under section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act 2005 and more over the PIO submitted during the hearing that, he had received a letter from Aditya Mein, S/o Chowna Mein, stating that his family members do not intend to give their personal information. The information sought was denied by the FAA

The PIO-Cum-ADC, Namsai made her deposition before the Commission today that she stands by the decision already taken decision already taken by the FAA and has nothing more to say.

That during the hearing the appellant's deposition was that the ST and PRC as sought by him is of larger public interest because he has doubts about the identity of the person.

> Section 8(1)(j) "*Information which relates to personal information the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest, or which would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the individual unless the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO) or the appellate authority is satisfied that the larger public interest justifies the disclosure.*"

After perusing the case record and hearing from the appellant, the Commission is of the view that RTI Act is not a tool to intrude into personal lives, especially where no public interest is involved. The RTI Act is not a surveillance tool and cannot be used to gather personal details of others without a strong and demonstrated public cause. RTI Act is designed to ensure accountability in governance and not to interfere into personal and professional lives of others without lawful justification.

In the instant case, no element of larger public interest is invoked by the appellant to justify overriding the privacy protections enshrined in the law. The appellant has not made a bona fide public interest in seeking information, the disclosure of such information would cause unwarranted invasion of privacy of the individual under sec 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act.

Therefore the Commission is of the view that the appellant has not succeeded in establishing that the information sought for is for the larger public interest.

he FAA's order is found to be reasoned and in accordance with Law.

Therefore the same is upheld and the appeal case no. APIC 272/A/2025 is dispose of and close.

Judgment/Order pronounced in the open Court by the Commission today on this **10th day of September, 2025**. Each copy of Judgment/Order be furnished to the parties.

Given under my hand and seal of this Commission/Court on this **10th day of September, 2025.**

Sd/-
(Khopey Thaley)
State Information Commissioner
APIC, Itanagar.
Dated Itanagar, the ..12.. Sept, 2025.

Memo.No.APIC-272/A//2025/885
Copy to:

1. The PIO-cum-ADC, Namsai, District Namsai, Arunachal Pradesh for kind information.
2. Shri Vijay Pertin & Shri Kalom Perme, Village-Ithili, PO/PS, Roing, Lower Dibang Valley, Arunachal Pradesh for information. Contact No. 7005487635
3. The Computer Programmer for upload on the Website and emailed to concerned.
4. Office Copy.

11/09/25

Registrar/Dy. Registrar,
APIC-Itanagar

Deputy Registrar
Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission
Itanagar