



ARUNACHAL PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION (APIC)
ITANAGAR

File No. APIC-243/2025 (Appeal)

Shri Vijay Pertin

Village Ithili, PO / PS: Roing
Lower Dibang Valley Dist. A.P.
(M) 7085172418
Pin: 792110

Appellant

versus

PIO,

O/o the Deputy Commissioner (DC)
Roing, Lower Dibang Valley District A.P.
Pin Code: 792110.

PIO-Respondent

ORDER

Date of Hearing: 13.07.2026

Date of Decision: 13.07.2026

INFORMATION COMMISSIONER : Dani Gamboo

Relevant facts emerging from appeal.

RTI application filed on	:	04.10.2024
SPIO replied on	:	5.12.2024
First appeal filed on	:	23.12.2024
First Appellate Authority's Order	:	10.09.2025
Second Appeal filed on	:	19.03.2026

Information sought:

The appellant has filed an RTI application dated 04.10.2024 seeking following information regarding ST & PRC of Shri Rahul Michichi & Shri Perkom Linggi.

Details of information required: -

1. Furnish copy of Scheduled Tribe certificates and PRC of Shri. Rahul Michichi (working as Data operator in BDO, office Roing) Bhismaknagar and Shri. Perkom Linggi, residing in Kapang village near Dambuk, if ST and PRC certificates issued to them by the concerned public authorities
2. Furnish copy of the name of father and mother of Shri. Rahul Michichi, Bhismaknagar and Shri. Perkom Linggi, Kapang village.
3. Furnish copy of name of the Deputy Commissioner or Additional Deputy Commissioner, Roing or SDO, Dambuk who issued ST and PRC certificates to the said two suspected Non-APST offsprings.

(Please furnish all sought documents in certified copies)

The following were present.

Appellant

: Present. He states that the PIO and the FAA has denied the information sought by him under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. He submits that in the APIC-217/2024 Shri Lokam Tassar vs PIO cum EAC, o/o the Deputy Commissioner, Capital Complex, Itanagar, the Hon'ble Information Commission Court of Shri Vijay Taram has ordered for furnishing of ST certificate and PRC of Shri Ha Tatu to the applicant. So, the similar information sought should be furnished.

Respondent PIO

: Absent.

Decision:

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 appellant Shri Vijay Pertin on 04.10.2024 filed an RTI application under Form-'A' before the PIO, O/o the Deputy Commissioner, Roing, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh whereby, seeking various information, as quoted in Form-A application. The Appellant, being not satisfied with the information denied by the PIO, filed the First Appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 23.12.2024. Appellant, again having denied the required information by the FAA, filed the Second Appeal before the Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission on 06.05.2026 and the Registry of the Commission (APIC), having receipt of the appeal, registered it as APIC No.243/A/2025 and processed the same for its hearing and disposal.

Whereas, the PIO has denied disclosure of information sought by the applicant as they are exempted under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005.

Whereas, this commission has passed an order dated 11.8.2025 directing FFA – Deputy Commissioner, Roing, Govt. of AP to conduct hearing on the first appeal filed to him, following the principle of natural justice, giving fair and equal opportunity to both the appellant and PIO and thereafter pass reasoned and speaking order on merit.

Whereas, the First Appellate Authority - Deputy Commissioner, Roing has heard the first appeal on 10.09.2025 and passed judgement order as follows –

"Whereas, the matter was heard by the Hon'ble State Information Commissioner, Shri Dani Gamboo, on 11th August 2025 at 1400 Hrs. During the hearing, the Hon'ble Commissioner observed that the FAA had not disposed of the first appeal following the statutory procedure and, accordingly, remanded the matter back to the FAA-Deputy Commissioner, Roing for appropriate disposal.

Whereas, in compliance with the said order, a hearing was fixed on 29/08/2025 at 1700 Hrs by the office of the undersigned, wherein the appellant Shri Vijay Pertin was present. The appeal pertained to the request for information regarding the Scheduled Tribe Certificates of Shri Rahul Michichi and Shri Perkom Linggi

Whereas, since the information sought relates to third-party individuals and involves their personal records, letters were issued to both Shri Rahul Michichi and Shri Perkom Linggi, seeking their comments in accordance with Section 11 of the RTI Act, 2005 (Third Party information Procedure). In response, both individuals submitted their objections, stating that the disclosure of their Scheduled Tribe Certificates would amount to an unwarranted invasion of their privacy and requested that the same may not be disclosed.

Whereas, upon perusal of the submissions and in light of the provisions of Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005, it is observed that:

"Information which relates to personal information, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest, or which would cause an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual shall not be disclosed unless the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer or the appellate authority, as the case may be, is satisfied that the larger public interest justifies the disclosure of such information."

Whereas, in the present case, no larger public interest justifying the disclosure has been established by the appellant. Moreover, the Scheduled Tribe Certificate is a personal document, the disclosure of which may indeed lead to an unwarranted invasion of privacy, as objected to by the third parties.

Hence, in view of the above facts, submissions of the third parties, and the relevant legal provisions under the RTI Act, 2005, particularly Section 8(1)(j), the request for disclosure of the Scheduled Tribe Certificates of Shri Rahul Michichi and Shri Perkom Linggi is hereby declined. The appeal is accordingly disposed of."

Whereas, in the appeal case APIC-272/A/2025: Shri Vijay Pertin & Kalom Perme Vs. PIO - cum-SDO, Tezu (wherein the appellant sought information regarding Scheduled Tribe Certificate and Permanent Resident Certificate of Shri Chowna Mein) in the APIC Hon'ble Commission Court of Shri Khopey Thaley passed an order as:

"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 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 and close."

Whereas, 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 Public Information Officer (PIO) or the appellate authority is satisfied that the larger public interest justifies the disclosure" has been amended through Section 40(3) of the " the Digital Personal Data Protection act, 2023" as : In section 8 of the Right to information Act, 2005, in sub-section (1), for clause (j), the following clause shall be substituted, namely :-

"(j) information which relate to personal information."

Whereas, after perusing the case record and hearing from the appellant, the Commission is of the similar 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.

Whereas, 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.

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

Therefore, the same is upheld and the appeal case no APIC-243/A/2025 is disposed of and closed.

Order pronounced in the Open Court of this Commission today this 13th day of July' 2026. Each copy of the Judgement / Order be furnished to the parties.

Given under my hand and seal of this Commission / Court on this 13th day of July' 2026.

Sd/-
(Dani Gamboo)
Information Commissioner

Memo No. APIC-243/A/2025/ 12
Copy to:

Dated Itanagar the 13 July' 2026.

- ✓ 1. Computer Programmer Itanagar APIC to upload in APIC website and mailed to concerned department email.
2. Office copy.

P. G. isjshb
Registrar / Deputy Registrar
Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission
Itanagar

Deputy Registrar
Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission