

①

MIZORAM STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
NEW COMPLEX : KHATLA
AIZAWL, MIZORAM

SECOND APPEAL NO. 01/06 OF 2006 U/S 19(3) OF R.T.I. ACT, 2005

Rothanga, Secretary, Vigilance Cell, Mizoram Upa Pawl,
Opposite Raj Bhavan South Gate, M.G. Road, Aizawl Appellant

Vs

1. Department Appellate Authority (Joint Secretary),
Government of Mizoram, Aizawl Respondent No. 1
2. S.P.I.O., Agriculture Department, Govt. of Mizoram... Respondent No. 2

Decision

(17.11.06)

Pu Rothanga, Secretary, Vigilance Cell, Mizoram Upa Pawl, Opposite Raj Bhavan South Gate, M.G. Road, Aizawl, has preferred a second appeal by post against (failure to pass orders) order of Respondent No. 1 in first appeal case No. C. 32020/1/97-AGR which was filed against Respondent No. 2's refusal to admit application for information under Section 6(1) of the RTI Act, 2005.


The appellate and the Respondents were noticed for hearing on 17.11.2006. The appellant was allowed to exercise his option to appear or not to appear for hearing on 17.11.2006.

At the time of hearing, Respondents No. 1 and 2 appeared in person .
Heard.

Respondents No. 1 and 2 stated that the appellant had never applied for information neither before the Respondent No. 2 (PIO) nor filed first appeal before the Respondent No. 1.

There is nothing on record for coming to conclusion that the appellant had filed application under Section 6(1) of the Act nor first appeal before the Respondent No. 1 except paragraph No. 3 of his second appeal which states as under :-

“3. Particulars of the first appellate authority: Joint Secretary, Agriculture,
C. 32020/1/97-AGR dated 2.2.2006.”



1

The numbers stated above was taken as first appellate case which turns out to be not correct.

In the circumstances, there is no case for decision on merit.

The appeal stands dismissed.



(K. TLANTHANGA)
Information Commissioner



(ROBERT HRANGDAWLA)
Chief Information Commissioner