



ARUNACHAL PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION
ITANAGAR.

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

Case No. APIC- 193/2026.

(Summon to appear in person)

(Or.5 R.3 of CPC)

APPELLANT : Shri Lidu Rida, Tato.
RESPONDENT : The PIO, o/o the DLRSO Shi Yomi District (A.P)

ORDER/SUMMONS

This is an appeal under Section 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005 received from Shri Lidu Rida for non-furnishing of below mentioned information by the PIO, o/o the DLRSO Shi Yomi District (A.P) as sought for by him under section 6(1) (Form-A) of RTI Act, 2005 vide his application dated 07.11.2025.

A) Particulars of information: Disbursement land compensation for Lugi and Luyi land.

B) Details of Information:

1. Certified copy of disbarment records of amount related to the Lugi and Luyi land.
2. Name of the beneficiaries to whom the compensation amount was released.
3. Total amount credited to the beneficiary.
4. Date of disbursement and mode of payment (Cheque/ DD/ Online transfer)
5. Provide copy of sanction orders, approval notes, and correspondence related to the said disbursement.
6. State the Authority of officer who approved the payment despite the matter being sub-judice.
7. Provide details any action taken by or proceedings initiated by the Deputy Commissioner office of the being informed that the case is subjudice in the Hon'ble COURT OC CIVIL JUDGE (SENIOR DIVISION), Aalo, West Siang district Arunachal Pradesh, therefore it has requested to disburse the above said land compensation amount to any party's involved in the case until the case is solved and all the relevant document of the same land case which are not mentioning here.

Brief facts emerging from the appeal :

Records emerging from the appeal disclose that the appellant, Shri Lidu Rida, had requested the PIO for the aforementioned information / documents but failed to obtain the same which prompted him to appeal before the Deputy Commissioner, Shi Yomi District, Govt. of A.P, the First Appellate Authority under Section 19 (1) of RTI Act, 2005 vide Memo of Appeal dt. 16.12.2025 .

Records further reveal that FAA conducted hearing on 15.01.2026 and vide order dt.16.01.2026 as reproduced below, directed the PIO to furnish all the requisite information within 15 (fifteen) days as sought by the appellant in the application dt. 16.12.2025.

Shi Yomi District, Tato."

The appellant, however, filed his 2nd appeal before this Commission under section 19(30) of the RTI Act, 2005 his Memo of Appeal dt. 06.02.2026 on the ground, inter alia, that the PIO not only violated the provisions of section 7(1) and wilfully disobeyed the order passed by the FAA but also acted in malafide and evasive manner attracting penal action under section 20 of the RTI Act, 2005.

This Commission, however, notices that the relief sought (as reproduced below) in his appeal memo before this Commission do not match with his RTI queries in his application dt.07.11.2025 in Form-A. This Commission's adjudication on this appeal shall, therefore, be confined to only those queries listed in the appellant's RTI application dt.07.11.2025.

"PART-E : RELIEF SOUGHT

The Appellant most respectfully prays that that this Hon'ble Commission may be pleased to:

- 1. Hold that the Respondent has failed to j Highway from 15 km to 30 KM, including:
 - Award Sheets under Section 23, RFCTLARR Act, 2013;
 - Sanction notes and approval orders;
 - File notings and movement registers;
 - Correspondence between DC, DLRSO, Treasury and Gaon Burahs;
 - Measurement Books (MBs);
 - Valuation and compensation calculation sheets;
 - Reasons/approvals for releasing compensation during pendency of civil litigation;*
- 2. Initiate penalty proceedings under Section 20(1) of the RTI Act against the Respondent;*
- 3. Recommend disciplinary action under Section 20(2) of the RTI Act;*
- 4. Pass any other order deemed fit in the interest of justice and transparency."*

This appeal has, however, been listed on 20th May, 2026 wherein the PIO, Shri Miki Boje, DLR & SO appeared through VC while the appellant was represented by Advocate, Shri Lika Fancis Doke.

Hearing and decision:

This Commission heard the parties.

The Ld. Counsel for the appellant, reiterating the appellant's grievance that the PIO failed to furnish the complete and correct replies / information, pleaded for an appropriate direction to the PIO to furnish the information as prayed for in his appeal. The PIO, on the other hand, submitted that the o/o PIO had already furnished whatever information were available in the records.

This Commission, upon perusal of the relief sought for by the appellant in his appeal vis-à-vis the replies furnished by the PIO in his letter dt.02.02.2026, concludes that except for the queries Nos. 6 and 7, the replies to the preceding queries (1 to 5) are found to be specific and adequately furnished, subject to their correctness to be proved in a competent court of law if an occasion so arise. The replies to the queries 6 and 7 are, however, not specific rather the replies are vague in that the applicant/appellant, vide query No.6), had requested for the particulars of authority or officer authorising or according approval to the payment/release of the compensation amount while the replies of the PIO speaks about advice of the Standing Counsel. As regards the appellant's query No.7, the PIO had referred to letter dt. 03.10.2025 (from the Dy. Commissioner to the Standing Counsel seeking legal advice regarding a Keba decision

dt.13.06.2025 in Puchik Rakshap Clan Vs. Eling Ragmuk and ors on payment of compensation) and letter dt.06.10.2025 (from the S/Counsel to the DC, rendering his legal advice). The correspondence between the DC and the S/Counsel is silent about a case being sub-judice in the Court of Civil Judge (Senior Division) Aalo, to which the appellant's query pertains. The replies to those 2(two) queries, therefore, have to be specific and unambiguous. For instance, the PIO has to first admit or deny the existence of an appeal pending before the court of Civil Judge (Sr. Division) against the Keba decision dt.13.06.2026 as contended by the appellant and restraintment order, if any, therein, If no such appeal is pending, the question of furnishing the reply to query No.6 does not arise.

As advised during the course of hearing, the PIO shall furnish the specific replies as above to the 2(two) queries as per the appellant's RTI application dt.07.11.2026 so as not attract the provisions of section 18(1)(e), being incomplete, misleading or false information, and consequential penal action under section 20 of the RTI Act, 2005.

The PIO shall comply with the direction as above in right earnest and report the compliance thereof to this Commission on 10.07.2026, the next date of hearing.

● **NOW THEREFORE**, you are hereby summoned to appear in person or online in the Hon'ble Court of Shri Sangyal Tsering Bappu, **SIC on 10th July, 2026 (Friday) at 2 pm** to answer the claims, and you are directed to produce on that day all the documents upon which you intend to rely in support of your claims/defense.

Take notice that, in default of your appearance, on the day above- mentioned, the matter will be heard and determined in your absence.

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

Memo No. APIC-193/2026 / 857 Dated Itanagar, the 22 May, 2026

Copy to:

1. The Deputy Commissioner, Shi Yomi District, Tato, the First Appellate Authority (F.A.A) for information and ensuring compliance by the PIO.
2. The PIO, o/o the DLR & SO, Shi Yomi District, (Pin code-791001), for information and compliance..
3. Shri Lidu Rida, Tato Shi Yimi District (Pin code-791001), (Phone No. 6909709959) for information.
4. The Computer Programmer/Computer Operator for uploading on the website of APIC, please.
5. Office Copy.
6. S/Copy.

P. C. Singh
Registrar/ Deputy Registrar
APIC, Itanagar
Arunachal Pradesh Information Commission
Itanagar