



**MIZORAM INFORMATION COMMISSION
MINECO, KHATLA,
MIZORAM: AIZAWL**

Case No: C. 168/2025-MIC

***Raj V. Tamhankar,
Mumbai***

...Complainant

Vs

***Sangliana,
State Public Information Officer
&
Joint Director,
Dte. of Institutional, Finance & State Lottery***

... Respondent

RTI application filed on	:	21.03.2025
SPIO replied on	:	08.04.2025
First appeal filed on	:	NIL
Appellate Authority order	:	NIL
Complaint received on	:	29.04.2025
Date of Hearing	:	30.05.2025 at 12:00 Noon
Date of Decision	:	30.05.2025

1. The complainant submitted RTI application to the SPIO, Directorate of Institutional, Finance & State Lottery, Mizoram. Upon receipt of the RTI application, the SPIO informed the complainant that it was necessary for the RTI application to be accompanied by a photo ID of the complainant under the RTI Act. Being aggrieved with the reply received from the SPIO, complaint was submitted to the Commission.
2. Summons were issued to both the complainant and respondent to appear before the Mizoram Information Commission on 30.05.2025 (Friday) at 12:00 Noon. As scheduled, hearing was held in hybrid mode wherein the complainant attended via Video Conferencing and the respondent SPIO, accompanied by a representative from M/s Teesta Distributors were present in person. M/s Teesta Distributors' lawyer Ms. Surbhi Sawaria was also present via Video Conferencing.
3. The complainant stated that he was very surprised on being informed by the respondent SPIO that he had to submit his photo ID for seeking

information under the RTI Act as there is no rule under the Act and Rules to provide ID proof. He, however, sent his photo ID with his email address but till date, no response/communication was received from the SPIO.

4. In reply, the SPIO mentioned that since he and the dealing assistant were new in the department, on receiving the RTI application of the complainant, they had mistakenly asked for the photo ID of the complainant not knowing that ID proof is not required for seeking information under the RTI Act and Rules and that a reply on the matter was sent to the complainant on 19.05.2025. He also informed that the information sought pertains to third party information and the third party i.e. M/s Teesta Distributors strongly objected to the disclosure of the information sought.
5. After hearing both the parties, the respondent SPIO was asked to apologize to the Commission and the complainant. The SPIO tendered his apology, admitted to his error and assured that such error will not occur again in future. Further, the complainant, when asked by the Commission, as to whether he would like to settle the matter with regard to the information sought in his RTI application, he informed that he is satisfied that the hearing has resolved his current complaint (issue) and will approach the Departmental Appellate Authority (DAA) first instead.
6. In view of the circumstances, the Commission hereby directs that **Mr. Sangliana, SPIO & Joint Director, Directorate of Institutional, Finance & State Lottery shall send a copy of letter No. F.12023/1/15-DTE(IF&SL)/Pt dated 19.05.2025 to the complainant via email & WhatsApp upon conclusion of this hearing today itself i.e., 30.05.2025** with compliance report to this Commission.

The matter is hereby disposed of. Copy of this decision to be given free of cost to all the parties.



(MANGJANGAM TOUTHANG)
Information Commissioner
Mizoram Information Commission



(JOHN NEIHLAIA)
Chief Information Commissioner
Mizoram Information Commission