



12

MIZORAM INFORMATION COMMISSION
(Under the RTI Act, 2005)
MINECO, KHATLA, AIZAWL

Landline: 0389-2334833 / **Email:** mic.mizoram@gmail.com / **Website:**
mic.mizoram.gov.in

Case No. S.A. 318/2026-MIC

*John B. Junior,
Siaha.*

...Appellant

Vs

*P.C. Zonuntluangi,
SPIO & Joint Director,
Rural Development (Directorate).*

...Respondent

RTI application filed on	:	21.01.2026
SPIO replied on	:	NIL
First Appeal filed on	:	25.01.2026
DAA issued order/replied on	:	04.02.2026
Second Appeal received on	:	06.02.2026
Date & Time of hearing	:	25.02.2026 at 12:00 Noon
Date of decision	:	25.02.2026

Pu John Neihlaia, Chief Information Commissioner and Pu Mangjangam Touthang, Information Commissioner presided over the hearing.

FACTS OF THE CASE :

1. The appellant submitted RTI application via RTI Online seeking information on the following: -

Kum 2022 atanga 2025 (January) thlenga RD Department-a thil kalpui dan chungchangah a hnuaia hriat duh te hi min pe turin ka rawn dil a ni:

Contract & Tender: Kum 2022-2025 chhunga Directorate leh District tina Tender chhuah lova (Direct/Quotation hmanga) hna pek (Contract works) zawng zawngte leh a thawktu Contractor-te hming, Address, leh Amount list.

Unsanctioned Staff: Sawrkar hriatpui (Sanctioned) ni lo, Department emaw District-in an chhawr (Temporary/Casual) zawng zawngte hming leh an hlawh pekna 'Source of Fund'. Aikal (Proxy) chungchang: MGNREGS (MES) staff-te zinga 'Aikal' la an awm leh awm loh leh, Aikal lak phal lohna Order awm sa te.

Inspection Request: Bungrua supplier leh Cash Memo/Invoice copy-te chu a tam tham dawn avangin, RTI Act hnuaia 'Right to Inspect' hmangin In Office-ah hmuh/enfiah hmasak ka duh a. Ka enfiah hnuaia ka mamawh zual te chauh copy lak ka duh ang. Khawngaihin enfiah theih hun tur min hriattir dawn nia.

2. The SPIO denied his information quoting Sl. No. 12 of the Guide Book on RTI Act 2025 and informing him that his request contains multiple different subjects pertaining to different/unrelated subjects and asked him to re-submit the application. Aggrieved by this denial, the appellant preferred First Appeal to the DAA/FAA. The DAA/FAA gave a reply but feeling he was given incomplete information, the appellant preferred Second Appeal and summons were issued to the appellant and respondent to appear before the Commission.

3. As scheduled hearing was held where the respondent SPIO attended in person while the appellant absented himself without any prior notice to MIC. Mention may be made that it is the practise of MIC to remind both the appellant and respondent before the hearing date. However, in this case, when contacted in the mobile no. used for RTI online application, the call recipient informed that neither him nor his family members are aware of the RTI application/Second Appeal and no family member has the name of John B. Junior.

OBSERVATIONS: -

1. The reply sent by the respondent SPIO informing the appellant to submit separate RTI applications for separate subjects is not a valid ground and is against the spirit of the RTI Act. As per Section 6(3) of the RTI Act, 2005" Where an application is made to a public authority requesting for an information which is held by another public authority, the public authority to which such application is made, shall transfer the application or such part of it as may be appropriate to that other public authority and inform the applicant immediately about such transfer."

2. DOPT O.M No. 4/9/2008-IP dated 24.06.2008, makes it the responsibility of a public authority and it is the duty of the SPIOs not only to supply the information sought but also to render necessary help to the information seeker, wherever necessary. Further, while providing information or rendering help to a person seeking information, it is important to be courteous and to respect his/her dignity. Therefore, Pi P.C. Zonuntluangi, SPIO & Joint Director, Rural Development Department is informed to be more careful in dealing with RTI cases in future.


3. For every First Appeal received, the DAA/FAA, being vested with quasi-judicial powers, should hear both the parties viz appellant and respondent instead of sending a reply to the RTI query. The DAA/FAA shall, in every case inform the date of hearing at least seven (7) clear days before the date fixed as per Rule 7 (5) (a) of the Mizoram RTI Rules, 2010.

Order of the DAA/FAA shall be pronounced in open court and be in writing, duly authenticated by the DAA/FAA, for this purpose. Pu K. Lalrohlua, DAA/FAA & Director, Rural Development Department is informed to strictly adhere to the relevant provisions of the RTI Act/Rules for every First Appeal received by him in future.

DECISION:-

Since the appellant is not traceable and the contact number given belongs to some other person, the Commission is of the opinion that there is no point in hearing the case and proceed further.

The case is hereby disposed of accordingly.


(MANGJANGAM TOUTHANG)

Information Commissioner
Mizoram Information Commission




(JOHN NEIHLAIA)

Chief Information Commissioner
Mizoram Information Commission

Copy to: -

1. John B. Junior, Siaha, Ph: 6009633488.
2. P.C Zonuntluangi, SPIO & Joint Director. Rural Development Department (Directorate), Ph: 8974214794.

[Signature]
25/2/26

(LILY)

Secretary

**Mizoram Information Commission
Mizoram: Aizawl**