MANIPUR INFORMATION COMMISSION

सत्यमेव जयते

RIGHT TO INFORMATION

ꯏꯃꯤꯡ ꯑꯦꯡꯐꯣꯔꯃꯦ�far ꯀꯤꯃꯥꯖꯤꯟ ꯀꯤꯒꯅ꯭ꯤꯕꯥ

꯲꯰꯲꯳–꯲꯰꯲꯴



17th ANNUAL REPORT

2023-2024

सत्यमेव जयते

17th
ANNUAL REPORT 2023-24
(April 2023 - March 2024)



RIGHT TO
INFORMATION

MANIPUR INFORMATION COMMISSION

Secretariat North Block
Ground Floor, Behind Western Block
Imphal, Manipur-795001
Phone : 0385-2456495
Website :
www.maninfocom.nic.in
Email :
scicmanipur@gmail.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sl. No.	Contents	Page
1.	CHAPTER - I Introduction	01-02
2.	CHAPTER - II Implementation of the RTI Act, 2005 by Public Authorities during 2023-24.	03-21
3.	CHAPTER - III Manipur Information Commission 2023-24	22-34
	Photo	35-39
4.	CHAPTER - IV Disposal of Complaints by the State Information Commission	40-41
5.	CHAPTER - V Hearing and disposal of Second Appeals by the Commission	42-46
6.	CHAPTER - VI Penalties / Compensation and disciplinary action [Section-20(1) & (2) and 19(8)(b) of the RTI Act, 2005]	47-48
7.	CHAPTER - VII Recommendations	49-50
8.	Annexure - Significant decision of the Commission and important Government Notification / Office Memorandum	51-79

CHAPTER - 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Parliament of India on 12th May 2005 enacted The Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter, 'the Act' or 'RTI Act'), setting out a practical regime of the citizen's right to information. It is to secure access to the information, which are under the control of Public Authorities, in order to promote transparency and accountability in governance. It is also an Act to contain corruption in the bureaucracy. This Act has been one of the most empowering legislations for the citizens of the country.

1.2. While receiving mandatory disclosure of information from the public authorities, the Act has valiantly empowered the citizens of the country in seeking transparency in the functioning of government machineries. Since its inception, the act has been extensively used by the people on a range of issues, from holding the Government authorities accountable for delivery of basic rights and entitlements to questioning the actions of the higher offices of the country.

1.3. Under the mandate of Section 25 (1) of the Act, the Commission is submitting this Annual Report to the Government containing an overview of the status of implementation of this Act during the year 2023-24. The Annual Report-2022-23 has been submitted to the Government for placing before the State Legislature by the State Govt.

1.4. The primary objective of The Annual Report 2023-24 is to emphasize on the inputs received from the Public Authorities of different Government departments on the implementation of the RTI Act, 2005. The report consists of the analysis of data received from all the State Government Departments in accordance with the responsibility cast upon them under Section 25 (2) and 25 (3) of the Act.

1.5. The report includes: -

i) Number of requests for information received and disposed by the Public Information Officers,

ii) Number of First appeals received and disposed by the First Appellate Authority (FAA),

iii) Number of complaints and second appeals received and disposed by the Commission,

iv) Amount collected as RTI fees by the Public Information Officers,

v) Amount of Penalty imposed on Public Information Officers and compensation awarded to the complainants/appellants,

vi) Analysis of information furnished by Departments

vii) Accounts of the Commission

viii) Recommendations

ix) Abstract of salient/ important decisions taken by the Commission during the year.

1.6. Despite the momentous enactment of the Act for more than eighteen years, the Public Authorities have constantly failed to implement its significant provisions. Particularly, on Section 4 of the Act, which requires them to maintain all records duly catalogued and indexed and to provide information on seventeen parameters, Suo-motu, to the public at regular intervals. This also includes timely disposal of RTI applications by the SPIOs and first appeals by the FAA. It is indeed a matter of grave concern that it still remains a major bottleneck in effective implementation of the RTI Act. The failure to submit annual reports by the Government Departments further makes it infeasible to carry out comprehensive analysis of the data and consequently, delayed the completion of the Annual Report.

CHAPTER - II

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RTI ACT, 2005 BY PUBLIC AUTHORITIES DURING 2023-24

2.1. The citizens of the country are empowered by the Right to Information Act, 2005 in seeking information, which is available in any material form, from the Public Authorities. The Section 2 (f) of the Act defines what is "*information*" and the Section 2 (j) defines what is "*Right to Information.*" In the last 17 years, citizens are increasingly using the RTI Act for getting information from the Government and the Government-controlled organisations.

2.2. The Right to Information Act, 2005 also requires all the Government Departments to collect the relevant information/ data from all Public Authorities under their control and furnish the same to the State Information Commission for preparing the Annual Report of the year. The tables below contain data, which are compiled from the reports/ data provided by the Public Authorities of the Government Departments. The Commission finds that in spite of the legal provisions, there are many Government Departments, which do not submit their information/ data for preparing the annual report, and are hesitant to comply with the direction of the Commission. As many Departments did not submit the relevant information/ data called for by the Commission with reminders, the data shown in the tables below may not reflect the complete picture on the total number of RTI applications filed by the citizens to all the Public Authorities during the year under report.

Disposal of information requests by the Public Information Officers.

2.3 During the year 2023-24, a total number of 549 requests were received by the Public Information Officers. Out of these, 529 requests were disposed of by the SPIOs during the year including pending cases 35, representing 90.7% disposal. The balance requests were carried over to the next year for disposal. The total number of requests rejected by the

SPIOs is 14 (forteen). The disposal of RTI application by different Public Authority is given in Table-I.

2.4 **Disposal of First Appeals by the First Appellate Authority (FAA).**

The Section 19 (1) provides that – any person who does not receive a decision within the time specified in Sub-Section (1) or clause (a) of Sub-Section (3) of Section 7, or is aggrieved by a decision of the State Public Information Officer, may within 30 days from the expiry of such period or from the receipt of such a decision prefer First Appeal to such officer who is senior in rank to the State Public Information Officer, in each Public Authority.

During 2023-24, 100 numbers of first appeals were preferred before the FAA in the form of First Appeals under Section 19 (1) of the Act while 18 first appeals were carried forward from the previous year. Of this, 118 first appeals were disposed of by the FAA during the year representing 100% disposal. The disposal of the appeals by the FAA is given in Table II.

2.5 **Amount of fee & other charges collected by each Public Authority.**

A total amount of Rs. 4,392/- (four thousand three hundred and ninety two only) was collected by the SPIOs in the form of fees and other charges during

TABLE - I

DETAILS OF RTI APPLICATION RECEIVED AND PENDING IN THE STATE FOR THE PERIOD OF 1-4-2023- TO 31-03-2024

A.ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT :

Sl. No.	Name of Depett	Name of Public Authority	Total no. of PIOs	Total no. of applications pending as on 1-4-2023	Total no. of applications received during 1-4-2023 to 31-3-2024	Total of Col. 5+6	Total no. of disposed during the period 1-4-2023 to 31-3-2024	Total no. of applications pending as on 1-4-2024	Out of cases disposed shown in col. 8, no. of cases for which information is furnished	No. of requests deemed to be refused : Sec 7(2)	Out of total disposal in Col. 8, cases rejected under section														Amount of application fee & charges collected for furnishing information
											8(1)(a)	8(1)(b)	8(1)(c)	8(1)(d)	8(1)(e)	8(1)(f)	8(1)(g)	8(1)(h)	8(1)(i)	8(1)(j)	9	11	24	Other	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
1.	Adult Education	Commissioner	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.	Agriculture	Administrative Secretary	2	-	8	8	8	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.	Art & Culture	Secretariat Art & Culture	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4.	CAF & PD	-	2	-	5	5	5	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20/-
5.	DP & AR	Administrative Reforms	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7.	DP & AR	Personnel Division	2	-	7	7	7	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70/-
8.	Education(S)	Joint Secy	2	-	5	5	5	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	50/-
9.	Finance(Exp)	Chief Secretary	12	-	3	3	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10.	General Administration Department	Manipur Secretariat	4	-	5	5	5	-	1	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40/-
11.	Information & Public Relations	IPR		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
12.	MAHUD	Administrative Secretary	1	1	10	11	9	2	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	124/-
13.	Minority Affairs	Deputy Secy	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14.	OBC & SC	Commissioner	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15.	Power	Addl. Secy	2	-	3	3	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30/-
16.	RD & PR	Joint Secy	2	-	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
17.	Science & Technology	Sectt.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
18.	SCERT	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
19.	Sericulture	Sericulture	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20.	Skills, Labour, Employment & Entrepreneur-ship	Administrative Secy	9	-	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10/-
21.	Textiles, Commerce & Industry	Textiles, Commerce & Industry	2	-	6	6	6	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
22.	Transport	Under Secy	1	-	5	5	5	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30/-
23.	Works	Deputy Secy	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
24.	YAS	YAS	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
25.	Vigilance & Anti Corruption	Secretary	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

B. DIRECTORATE / HEAD OF DEPARTMENTS:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
26.	Adult Education	Addl. Director	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
27.	Agriculture	Director	10	-	12	12	12	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	120/-
28.	Art & Culture	Commissioner	12	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10/-
29.	AYUSH	Director	1	-	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20/-
30.	Board of Sec-ondary Educa-tion Manipur	Secretary	1	1	14	15	13	2	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	140/-
31.	CADA	Commissioner	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
32.	CAF & PD	CAF & PD	42	-	10	10	10	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90/-
33.	Council of Higher Secon-dary Education	Secretary	2	1	8	9	9	-	4	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	190/-
34.	Education(S)	Director	2	-	20	20	19	1	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	4	160/-
35.	Employment Exchange	Addl. Director	8	-	7	7	1	6	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70/-
36.	Economics & Statistics	Director	10	-	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20/-
37.	Environment & Climate Change	Director	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
38.	Excise	Commissioner	3	-	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
39.	Fisheries	Director	9	1	11	12	9	3	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	110/-
40.	Family Welfare Services	Director	2	-	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
41.	Fire Service	Director	1	-	3	3	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30/-
42.	Horticulture & Soil Conservation	Director	17	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10/-
43.	Health Services	Director	1	-	14	14	13	1	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40/-
44.	Handlooms & Textiles	Director	1	-	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20/-
45.	Information Technology	Director	1	-	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20/-
46.	Information & Public Relations	DIPR	3	-	9	9	9	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
47.	Minority Affairs	Director	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
48.	Minor Irrigation	Minor Irrigation	4	-	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20/-
49.	MAHUD	Director	28	-	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20/-
50.	Works	SE (HQ)	14	6	23	29	16	13	16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	190/-
51.	Prosecution	Director	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
52.	Prisons & Correction	Home Department	1	16	6	22	22	-	22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60/-
53.	Public Prosecution (District)	Public Prosecution (District)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
54.	PHED	CE / PHED	31	-	12	12	2	10	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	110/-
55.	Relief & Rehabilitation	Director	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
56.	State Academy of Training	State Academy of Training	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
57.	Science & Technology	Director	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
58.	Settlement & Land Records	DSO	10	-	10	10	10	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100/-
59.	SCERT	Director	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
60.	Trade, Commerce & Industries	Director	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
61.	Treasuries & Accounts	Director	2	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10/-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
62.	Tourism	Tourism	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
63.	Town Plalning	Town Planning	1	-	5	5	5	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30/-
64.	Transport	Director	5	-	48	48	48	-	48	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	480/-
65.	Taxation	Department of Taxes	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
66.	Vety & A.H Services	Director	1	-	21	21	21	-	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	190/-
67.	Welfare of OBC & SC	Director	2	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
68.	Water Resources	SE	1	5	14	19	19	-	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	140/-

C. HIGH COURT/COMMISSIONS/SOCIETY/AUTHORITY/AGENCY/LIMITED/JNIMS/ASSEMBLY/UNIVERSITY/DEPUTY COMMISSIONERS:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
69	High Court of Manipur	Registrar (Judicial)	2	3	48	51	42	9	35	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90/-
70.	Manipur Information Commission	MIC	1	-	11	11	11	-	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100/-
71.	Manipur Human Right Commission	Under Secy	1	-	3	3	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30/-
72.	Manipur Public Service Commission	Deputy Secy	1	-	53	53	53	-	47	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	398/-
73.	State Election Commission	Secretary	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
74.	Manipur State Commission for Women	MSCW	1	-	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20/-
75.	Manipur Development Society	Project Director	1	-	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20/-
76.	State Health Society, NHM	Director	3	-	3	3	2	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	120/-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
77.	Manipur State Film Development Society	Secretary	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
78.	Registrar Co-op-erative Societies	Cooperation	18	-	40	40	38	2	38	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	400/-
79.	Manipur Renew-able Energy Development Agency	Director	1	-	4	4	4	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
80.	Planning & Development Authority	Secretary	3	-	3	3	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30/-
81.	Manipur Legisla-tive Assembly	Secretary	1	-	6	6	4	2	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60/-
82.	Manipur Technical University	Registrar	1	-	3	3	2	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30/-
83.	JNIMS	Director	1	-	12	12	12	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	120/-
84.	Manipur State Power Distribution Company Ltd.	Executive Director	21	-	9	9	8	1	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90/-
85.	Manipur State Power Company Limited	Managing Director	12	-	2	2	2-		2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20/-
86.	Imphal Smat City Limited	MAHUD	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10/-
87.	Deputy Commissioner Imphal East	*																							
88.	Deputy Commissioner Kangpokpi	DC	2	-	3	3	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30/-
89.	Deputy Commissioner Kakching	DC	3	-	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
90.	Deputy Commissioner Pherzawl	DC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
91.	Deputy Commissioner Senapati	DC	1	-	4	4	4	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
92.	Deputy Commissioner Thoubal	DC	1	-	5	5	5	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50/-
93.	Deputy Commissioner Ukhrul	DC	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total :			35	549	583	529	54	296	14					1						5				13	4,392/-

Note : *The required information from the Department / Public Authority is not available.

the year 2023-24. The details of the fees and other charges collected by different Departments are indicated in Table - I.

2.6 **Implementation of provisions of Section 4 of the RTI Act, 2005 by different Public Authorities.**

A compilation of data submitted by different Public Authorities/ Government Departments reveals that many Departments still failed to implement the provisions of Section 4 of the RTI Act, 2005 which mandates every Public Authority to maintain all its records duly catalogued, computerised, indexed and publish information on seventeen points regarding the functioning of the Department, suo-motu, and update the same at regular intervals. Even though some Departments have published the same on time, it is not updated at regular intervals and many Departments have not yet opened their website. The following Table-III shows the status on the implementation of Section 4 of the RTI Act, 2005 by different Public Authorities, which have submitted the information in this regard.

As highlighted in the Table-III, out of the total 93 Public Authorities, which have furnished the annual report/ data, only 33 Public Authorities have made the Suo-motu disclosure under Section 4(1)(b) of the Act. For 60 Public Authorities, the matter is under process while a large number of Public Authorities have not done it at all.

TABLE - II

DETAILS OF FIRST APPEALS RECEIVED, DISPOSED AND PENDING IN THE STATE FOR THE PERIOD 1-4-2023 TO 31-3-2024

A.ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT :

Sl. No.	Name of Depett	Name of Public Authority	No. of Appellate Authorities	Total no. of 1st appeals pending as on 1-4-2023	Total no. of 1st appeals received during 1-4-2023 to 31-3-20204	Total of Col. 5+6	Total no. of 1st appeals disposed during the period 1-4-2023 to 31-3-2024	Total no. of 1st appeals pending as on 1-4-2024	Out of total cases disposed shown in Col. 8 cases where information furnished	Out of total disposal in Col. 8, cases rejected under section													
										8(1)(a)	8(1)(b)	8(1)(c)	8(1)(d)	8(1)(e)	8(1)(f)	8(1)(g)	8(1)(h)	8(1)(i)	8(1)(j)	9	11	24	Other
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
1.	Adult Education	Commissioner	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.	Agriculture	Administrative Secretary	1	-	6	6	6	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.	Art & Culture	Art & Culture	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4.	CAF & PD	-	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5.	Co-operation	Co-operation	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6.	DP & AR	Administrative Reforms	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7.	DP & AR	Personnel Division	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8.	Education(S)	Commissioner	1	-	5	5	5	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
9.	Finance	Chief Secretary	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10.	GAD	Manipur Secretariat	1	-	5	5	5	-	1	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11.	Information & Public Relations	Commissioner	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
12.	MAHUD	Administrarive Secretary	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13.	Minority Affairs	Commissioner	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14.	OBC & SC	Commissioner	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15.	Power	Administrative Secy	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16.	RD & PR	Addl. CS	1	-	6	6	6	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
17.	Science & Technology	Science & Technology	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
18.	SCERT	SCERT	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
19.	Sericulture	Sericulture	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20.	Skill, Labour, Employment & Entrepreneur-ship	Administrative Secretary	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
21.	Textiles, Commerce & Industry	Textiles, Commerce & Industry	1	-	3	3	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
22.	Transport	Under Secy	1	-	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
23.	Works	Works	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
24.	YAS	YAS	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
25.	Vigilance & Anti-Corruption	Secretary	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

C. DIRECTORATE / HEAD OF DEPARTMENT :

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
26.	Adult Education	Addl. Director	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
27.	Agriculture	Director	2	-	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
28.	Art & Culture	Commissioner	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
29.	AYUSH	Director	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
30.	Board of Secon-dary Education Manipur	BOSEM	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
31.	CADA	Commissioner	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
32.	CAF & PD	CAF & PD	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
33.	Council of Higher Secon-dary Education Manipur	Chairman	1	-	4	4	4	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
34.	Education(S)	Education(S)	1	-	6	6	6	2	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
35.	Employment	Employment Exchange	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
36.	Economics & Statistics	Director	1	-	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
37.	Environment & Climate Change	Director	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
38.	Excise Deptt.	Excise	1	-	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
39.	Fisheries	Fisheries	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
40.	Family Welfare Services	Director	1	-	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
41.	Fire Serivice	Director	1	-	3	3	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
42.	Horticulture & Soil Conserva-tion	Horticulture & Soil Conservation	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
43.	Health Services	Director	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
44.	Handlooms & Textiles	Director	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
45.	Information Technology	Special Secy (IT)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
46.	Information & Public Relations	DIPR	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
47.	Minority Affairs	Director	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
48.	Minor Irrigation	Minor Irrigation	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
49.	MAHUD	Director	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50.	Public Works Department	SE (HQ)	1	1	4	5	2	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
51.	Prosecution	Prosecution	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
52.	Prisons & Correctional	Home Department	1	16	6	22	22	-	22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
53.	Public Prosecution (District)	Public Prosecution (District)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
54.	Public Health Engineering	Secretary	1	-	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
55.	Relief & Rehabilitation	Director	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
56.	State Academy of Training	State Academy of Training	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
57.	Science & Technology	Science & Technology	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
58.	Settlement & Land Records	Director	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
59.	SCERT	SCERT	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
60.	Trade, Comm-erce & Industries	Trade, Commerce & Industries	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
61.	Treasuries & Accounts	Director	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
62.	Tourism	Tourism	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
63.	Town Planning	Town Planning	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
64.	Transport	Director	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
65.	Taxation	Taxation	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
66.	Vety & A.H. Services	Director	1	-	3	3	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
67.	Welfare of OBC & SC	Director	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
68.	Water Resources	Water Resources	1	-	19	19	19	-	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

C. HIGH COURT/COMMISSIONS/SOCIETY/AUTHORITY/AGENCY/LIMITED/JNIMS/ASSEMBLY/UNIVERSITY/DEPUTY COMMISSIONERS:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
69.	High Court of Manipur	Registrar (General)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
70.	Manipur Information Commission	Manipur Information Commission	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
71.	Manipur Human Right Commission	Under Secretary	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
72.	Manipur Public Service Commission	Secretary	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
73.	State Election Commission	Secretary	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
74.	Manipur State Commission for Women	Manipur State Commission for Women	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
75.	Manipur Development Society	Project Director	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
76.	State Health Society	State Health Society (NHM)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
77.	Manipur State Film Develop-ment Society	*																					
78.	Cooperative Socities	Registrar Co-operative Society	1	-	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
79.	Manipur Renewable Energy Development Agency	Director	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
80.	Planning & Development Authority	Secretary	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
81.	Manipur Legislative Assembly	Manipur Legislative Assebly	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
82.	Manpur Techni-cal University	Manipur Techni cal University	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
83.	JNIMS	JNIMS	*																				
84.	Manipur State Power Distribu-tion Company Limited	Managing Director	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
85.	Manipur State Power Company Limited	MSPCL	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
86.	Imphal Smat City Limited	MAHUD	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
87.	Deputy Commissioner Imphal East	Deputy Commissioner Imphal East	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
88.	Deputy Commissioner Kangpokpi	Deputy Commissioner Kangpokpi	1	-	3	3	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
89.	Deputy Commissioner Kakching	Deputy Commissioner Kakching	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
90.	Deputy Commissioner Pherzawl	Deputy Commissioner Pherzawl	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
91.	Deputy Commissioner Senapati	Deputy Commissioner Senapati	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
92.	Deputy Commissioner Thoubal	Deputy Commissioner Thoubal	1	-	3	3	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
93.	Deputy Commissioner Ukhrul	Deputy Commissioner Ukhrul	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
			Total :	**18**	**100**	**118**	**118**	**5**	**107**	**4**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**2**

Note : *The required information from the Department / Public Authority is not available.

TABLE - III

Status of Implementation of Section 4 of RTI Act 2005 by different Public Authorities

A. ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT :

Sl. No.	Name of Department	Whether the records of the office are catalogued and indexed to facilitate any extraction or recovery of information when applied for ? [Section 4(1)(a)]	Whether the records are computerized or not? [Section 4(1)(a)]	Whether the information as required to be published u/s 4(1)(b) of the RTI Act, 2005 has been published or not ?
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Adult Education	Yes	Not yet ready	Yes
2.	Agriculture	Yes	Yes	Yes
3.	Art & Culture	No	No	Not yet published
4.	CAF & PD	Yes	Some records are computerized	Under Process
5.	DP & AR (AR Division	Yes	Partially Computerized	Yet to be published
6.	DP & AR (Personnel Division)	Partly implemented	Partly implemented	Partly implemented
7.	Education(S)	Yes	Partially computerized	Under process
8.	Finance (Expenditure Section)	Yes	Partly computerized Partly	No
9.	GAD	Proper filing indexing done	No	Yes
10.	Information & Public Relations	Yes	Yes	No
11.	MAHUD	Yes	Yes	N/A
12.	Minority Affairs	Yes	No	Partly
13.	OBC & SC	Yes	No	Under process
14.	POWER	Yes	Mostly computerized	No
15.	PHED	Yes	Yes	Yes
16.	RD & PR	Yes	Yes	Yes
17.	Science & Technology	Yes	Some records are computerized but not all	Yes
18.	SCERT	Yes	Not yet ready	No
19.	Sericulture	Yes	Yes	No
20.	Skills, Labour, Employment & Entrepreneurship	Yes	Yes	Not published yet

1	2	3	4	5
21.	Textiles, Commerce & Industry	Yes	Partially	Not yet published
22.	Transport	Yes	Yes	No
23.	Works	Yes	Yes	Under process
24.	YAS	Partially	Partially	Under process
25.	Vigilance & Anti-Corruption Deptt.	Yes	Under process	Under Process

B. DIRECTORATE / HEAD OF DEPARTMENTS:

1	2	3	4	5
26.	Adult Education	Yes	Not Yet	No
27.	Agriculture Department	No	No	No
28.	Art & Culture	No	No	Not Yet published
29.	AYUSH	No	Not yet	Not yet
30.	Board of Secondary Education Manipur	Yes	Not Yet	No
31.	CADA	Yes	Under Process	Yes
32.	CAF & PD	Yes	Process initiated	Under process
33.	Council of Higher Secondary Education, Manipur	Yes	No	Under preparation
34.	Education(S)	Yes	Partly computerised.	Under process
35.	Employment	Yes	50% computerized	Yes
36.	Economics & Statistics	Yes	Yes	Published
37.	Enviroment & Climate Change	Yes	Yes	No
38.	Excise Department	Yes	Yes	Under process
39.	Fisheries Deptt.	Yes	No	No
40.	Family Welfare Services	Yes	Yes	No
41.	Fire Services	Yes	No	No
42.	Horticulture & Soil Conservation	Partially	Partially	No
43.	Health Services	No	No	No
44.	Haldlooms & Textiles	Yes	Partially	Yes
45.	Information Technology	Yes	Yes	No
46.	Information & Public Relations	Partially completed	In process	Yes

1	2	3	4	5
47.	Minority Affairs	Yes	Yes	Under process
48.	Minor Irrigation	Yes	Yes	Yes
49.	MAHUD	Yes	Not Yet	No
50.	Public Works Department	Not yet	Not Yet	No
51.	Prosecution	Yes	Under process	No
52.	Prisons & Correctional	No	No	No
53.	Public Prosecutor (District)	Yes	No	No
54.	PHED	Yes	Yes	Yes
55.	Relief & Rehabilitation	Yes	No	Yes
56.	State Academy of Training	Yes	Partially	No
57.	Science & Technology	Yes	50% completed	Some parts published.
58.	Settlement & Land Records	Yes	No	Yes
59.	SCERT	Yes	Yes	Yes
60.	Trade, Commerce & Industries	Yes	Not yet	Published
61.	Treasuries & Accounts	Yes	Yes	No
62.	Tourism	Yes	No	No
63.	Town Planning	Yes	Partial	Yes
64.	Transport	No	Yes	No
65.	Taxation	Yes	Yes	Yes
66.	Vety & A.H Services	Yes	No	No
67.	Welfare of OBC & SC	Yes	Yes	Under process
68.	Water Resources	Yes	No	No

C. **HIGH COURT/COMMISSIONS/SOCIETY/AUTHORITY/AGENCY/ LIMITED/JNIMS/ASSEMBLY/UNIVERSITY/DEPUTY COMMISSIONERS:**

1	2	3	4	5
69.	High Court of Manipur	Yes	Yes	Yes
70.	Manipur Information Commission	Partial	Partial	Yes
71.	Manipur Human Right Commission	Yes	No	Yes
72.	Manipur Public Service Commission	Yes	Under process	Yes
73.	State Election Commission	Yes	Some records are computerized	Yes
74.	Manipur State Commission for Women	Yes	Yes	Not yet
75.	Manipur Development Society	Yes	No	No

1	2	3	4	5
76.	State Health Society, NHM	No	No	No
77.	Manipur State Film Development Society	Yes	No	Not yet
78.	Registrar Co-operative Society	No	No	No
79.	Manipur Renewable Energy Development Agency (MANIREDA)	Yes	Yes	Yes
80.	Planning & Development Authority	Yes	Yes	Yes
81.	Manipur Legislative Assembly	On process	On process	On process
82.	Manipur Technical University	Yes	Yes	Yes
83.	JNIMS	Yes	Yes	Yes
84.	Manipur State Power Distribution Company Limited	Yes	Under process	Under process
85.	Manipur State Power Company Limited	Yes	Yes	No
86.	Imphal Smart City Limited	Yes	Yes	Yes
87.	Deputy Commissioner, Imphal East	*		
88.	Deputy Commissioner, Kangpokpi	Yes	No	No
89.	Deputy Commissioner, Kakching	Yes	No	Yes
90.	Deputy Commissioner, Pherzawl	Yes	Not yet	Yes
91.	Deputy Commissioner, Senapati	Yes	No	Yes
92.	Deputy Commissioner, Thoubal	Yes	Ongoing	No
93.	Deputy Commissioner, Ukhrul	Yes	No	Yes

Note : *The required information from the Department / Public Authority is not available.

CHAPTER – III

MANIPUR INFORMATION COMMISSION

3.1 The right to information Act, 2005 (Act No. 22 of 2005), is an Act to provide for setting out the practical regime of the right to information under the control of the public authorities, and to promote transparency and accountability in the working of every public authority.

The state Government has constituted the Manipur Information Commission vide Government order No. 11/7/2005-AR dated 12-09-2006, Published in the Manipur Gazetted Notification No. 219 dated 16-09-2006, in order to ensure a successful implementation of the Right to Information Act, 2005.

The State information Commission shall consist of -

(a) the State Chief Information Commission and

(b) Such under of State Information Commissioners, not exceeding ten, as may be deemed necessary.

The general superintendence, direction and management of the officers of the State Information Commission shall vest in the state Chief Information Commissioner who shall be assisted by the State Information Commissioners and may exercise all such powers and do all such acts and things which may be exercised or done by the State Information Commission autonomously without being subjected to direction by any other authority under the Act.

The State Chief Information Commissioner or a State Information Commissioners shall before he enters upon his office make and subscribe before the Governor or some person appointed by him in that behalf, an oath or affirmation according to the form set out for the purpose in the 1st schedule.

The State Information Commission of Manipur stands as vital institutional mechanism under the RTI Act, 2005, playing a central role in promoting transparency, accountability, and participatory governance with the statutory provisions of the RTI Act, the commission is an autonomous, quasi judicial body that adjudicates matters related to access to information held by public authorities in Manipur. Its inception mark a crucial step in the evolution of democratic governance in the state, empowering citizen to seek information and hold public functionaries accountable.

The commission serves not only as a form for redressal of grievances arising out of denial or delay in providing information under the RTI Act but also as a facilitator for building an informed citizenry. Through its enforcement and advisory powers, it ensures that public authorities comply with the letter and spirit of the Act, enabling proactive and timely disclosure of information.

The terms of office of the past and present State Chief Information Commissioners and State Information Commissioners are given below:-

Sl.No.	Name of Chief Information Commissioner/Information Commissioner	Terms of office
1	R.K. Angousana Singh, IAS (Retd), State Chief Information Commissioner	12-09-2006 to 12-09-2011
2	Ch. Birendra Singh, IAS (Retd), State Information Commissioner	19-12-2008 to 31-03-2013
3	Th. Ibobi Singh, IFS (Retd), State Chief Information Commissioner	04-05-2015 to 28-02-2019
4	Dr. Soibam Ibocha Singh, IPS (Retd), State Inforamtion Commissioner	22-10-2018 to 08-08-2021
5	Oinam Sunil Singh, State Information Commissioner (SCIC in-charge)	22-10-2018 to 21-10-2023
6	Koijam Radhashyam Singh, IPS (Retd), State Chief Information Commissioner	21-10-2023 to till date

3.2 Constitutional and legal status:

The State Information Commission is a statutory body established under Section 15 of the RTI Act, 2005. It derives its legitimacy and authority from the central legislation enacted by the Parliament of India, which mandate every state government to constitute State Information Commission for the purpose of implementing the provisions of the Act.

The commission functions independently of the executive branch of the state government. Although it is appointed by the Governor of Manipur based on the recommendation from a high level committee consisting of the Chief Minister, the leader of the Opposition in the state legislative. Assembly, and a cabinet Minister, it operates as automatons institution with secure term and clearly defined powers. The State Chief Information Commissioner (SCIC) and State Information Commissioners (SICs) are appointed for a fixed term and enjoy the status and privileges equivalent to those of a Judge which re-enforce the institutional autonomy and integrity of the commission. This statutory design ensures that the commission functions free from political or bureaucratic interference, thereby upholding the sanctity of the RTI regime.

The status of the State Chief Information Commissioner and Information Commissioners (ICs) underwent a significant transformation after the Right To Information (Amendment) Act, 2019, particularly to their independence, tenure, and service conditions.

Prior to the 2019 amendment, the RTI Act, 2005 conferred a clearly defined and elevated statutory status on Information Commissioners. At the state level, the State Chief Information Commissioner and State Information Commissioners enjoyed status, salary and service conditions equivalent to Election Commissioner of India and Chief Secretary of the State concerned. This statutory parity was deliberately built into the Act to ensure that Information Commissions function as independent adjudicatory bodies, insulated from executive influence, given their critical role in enforcing

transparency and accountability under the RTI regime. Their tenure was fixed at 5 years or up to the age of 65 years whichever was earlier and their salaries and allowances were protected by statute, not subject to executive discretion.

After the 2019 amendment, this statutory equivalence and fixed status were expressly removed. The amended act substituted earlier provisions with a clause stating that the term of office, salary, allowances and other conditions of service of the SCIC & SICs shall be such as may be prescribed by the Central Government.

3.3 Jurisdiction and powers:

The jurisdiction of the Manipur Information Commission extends to all public authorities under state government of Manipur, including

i) Departments of the state government.

ii) Local bodies (Municipalities & Panchayets, ADCs in the hill).

iii) Government aided educational institutions.

iv) Autonomous bodies and public sector undertakings.

v) Non Governmental Organisations substantially funded by the Government.

Under Section 18 of the RTI Act, the Commission has the power to receive and enquire into complaints from any person who:

a) Has been unable to submit a request to the public information officer (P.O.) due to refusal and non appointment.

b) Has been refused access to information.

c) Has not received a response within the prescribed time.

d) Has received incomplete, misleading, a false information.

e) Found the prescribed fee unreasonable.

f) Has found any other grievances relating to seeking information.

Under Section 19, it hears second appeals against decision of P.Os or FAA and issues binding orders.

Under section 20, it may imposed penalties on erring PIOs up to Rs.25,000/- (Rupees twenty five thousand) only for wilful denial or delay in providing information.

The commission has also powers of a civil court while enquiring into any matters, inclining.

i) Summon and enforcing the attendance of persons.

ii) Requiring recovery and inspection of documents.

iii) Receiving evidence on affidavits.

iv) Requisition any public record from public authorities.

v) Issuing summon and examining witness.

iii) Imposing penalties for non compliance.

iv) Ordering compensation to complainant in deserving cases.

3.4 Monitoring and reporting :

As per section 25 of the RTI Act, the commission is mandated to:

i) Collect and analyse annual reports from all public authorities on RTI implementation.

ii) Prepare a consolidate Annual Report based on input from these submission.

iii) Submit the report to the State Government, which is laid before the Manipur Legislative Assembly.

This function ensures that the implementation of the RTI Act is monitored systematically and that policy recommendations as can be made for improving transparency and access to information.

3.5 Promotion of RTI awareness.

The Commission is also responsible for conducting.

i) Public Awareness Campaign.

ii) Capacity building and training for PIOs and appellate authorities.

iii) Workshop for students, civil society etc.

3.6 Advisory Role:

Under Section 25(5) the commission may recommend to the appropriate authority steps that ought to be taken for the promotion of conformity with the Act, including:

i) Training of PIOs & officials.

ii) Standardizing RTI procedures

iii) Ensuring proactive disclosure under section 4 of the RTI Act.

3.7 Recent Initiatives and Digital Transformation.

In recent years, the Manipur State Information Commission has initiated steps to modernise its functioning, such as.

i) RTI appeals and complaints online portal.

ii) Introduction of Video Conferring for appeals and complaints hearing.

iii) Up gradation of website to a citizen friendly mode where information can be easily accessed.

iv) Digitations of case records.

v) Further efforts are taken up to align the functional status of MIC with the help of CIC and NIC Manipur.

3.8 Powers and functions of the Manipur Information Commission.

The Manipur Information Commission was constituted to exercise the powers and to perform duties and functions as laid down in the Chapter V of the RTI Act, 2005. Section 15 (4) of the Act provides that general superintendence, direction and management of the affairs of the State Information Commission shall vest on the State Chief Information Commissioner, who may exercise all such powers and do all such acts and things as may be exercised or done by the State Information Commission autonomously, without being subjected to directions by any other authority.

The Information Commission has wide-ranging powers. It has the power to require public authorities to provide access to information, appoint State Public Information Officers (SPIOs), publish various categories of information and make changes to the practices of record maintenance. The Commission is also empowered to order an inquiry if there are reasonable grounds to do so and also has the power of a civil court in respect of enforcing attendance of persons, discovery of documents, receiving evidence on affidavits and issuing summons for examination of witnesses or documents. Section 19 (8)(c) and Section 20 of the Act empowers the Information Commission to impose penalties on erring officials. As per Section 20 (2), the Commission can recommend disciplinary action against a SPIO for "persistent" violation of one and more provisions of the Act. Further under Section 19 (8) (b) of the Act, the Information Commission can require the Public Authority to compensate the Complainant for any loss or other detriment suffered.

Currently, the Manipur Information Commission is manned by the following staff only, which is completely inadequate.

Sl.No.	Designation of the Post	No.	Remarks
1.	State Chief Information Commissioner (in-charge)	1	
2.	Joint Secretary	1	Posted by DP.
3.	Joint Secretary (Manipur Information Commission)	1	
4.	Deputy Registrar (Judicial)	2	On deputation from Education(S) Department.
5.	PA	1	Posted by GAD.
6.	Office Assistant	3	
7.	Peon	2	
8.	Computer Assistant	1	Engaged by the Commission on Contract basis since 12-9-2016.
9.	Driver	1	
10.	Peon	1	

3.9 The Commission has no official building of its own and presently, it carries out its functions from the temporary accommodation allotted by the Government in the State Secretariat, North Block, Imphal.

The present official address of the Commission is as follows: -

Manipur Information Commission
Secretariat North Block, Ground Floor,
Behind Western Block, Imphal, Manipur
Pin - 795001.
Phone - 0385 2456495
Website - www.maninfocom.nic.in
Email - scicmanipur@gmail.com

3.10 Nodal Department: -

The Administrative Reforms Department is the Nodal Agency of the Manipur Information Commission. All administrative matters are being taken up and routed through the Nodal Department. The Annual Report prepared by the Commission under Section 25(1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 is forwarded through the Nodal Department for laying the same before the State Legislative Assembly.

Powers and functions of the officers and employees of the Manipur Information Commission: -

Sl. No.	Designation	Powers and Duties
1.	State Chief Information Commissioner (SCIC), Manipur.	General superintendence, direction and management of affairs of the Manipur Information Commission, adjucation of complaints and second appeals from citizens. Co-ordinate with State Information Commissioner as well as with different Departments of the State Government to ensure proper implementation of the Right to Information Act, 2005.
2.	State Information Commissioner (SIC), Manipur	To assist the State Chief Information Commissioner (SCIC) in dealing with second appeals and complaints in respect of Departments / Organizations allocated to the State Information Commissioner.
3.	Joint Secretary / Deputy Secretary	To assist the Commission in proper implementation of the RTI Act. General supervision of administration and overall supervision of planning, budget and financial management, and to function as FAA of the Commission.
4.	Deputy Registrar (Judicial)	Judicial officer of the Commission for overseeing quasi-judicial functions. Assisting the SCIC/SIC for smooth functioning of the Bench. Providing legal assistance to the Commission and dealing with legal matters connected with court cases. Compilation of annual reports and updation of website. One Dy. Registrar is SPIO of the Commission.

5.	Personal Assistant	To assist the State Chief Information Commissioner / Information Commissioner in the discharge of their duties.
6.	Office Assistant	To provide secretarial assistance to the Deputy Secretary in administrative functions and the Deputy Registrar in disposal of complaint and second appeal cases
7.	Grade-IV including Driver	To perform duties as assigned to them by the SCIC/SIC and Deputy Secretary in routine course.

3.11 Name and designation of the Public Information Officer:

Sl. No.	Name of Public Authority	Name & Designation of the designated Appellate Authority	Name & Designation of the SPIO
1.	Manipur Information Commission	Shri G. Shantikumar Kabui, MCS, Joint Secretary, MIC, Manipur Secretariat, North Block (Room No. 44), Imphal - 795001	Shri S. Inao Singh, Deputy Registrar (Judl-I), Manipur Information Commission, Secretariat North Block, Imphal-795001

3.12 Name and designation of Nodal Officer :

Sl. No.	Name of Public Authority	Name & Designation of the designated Nodal Officer
1.	Manipur Information Commission	Shri G. Shantikumar Kabui, MCS, Joint Secretary, MIC, Manipur Secretariat, North Block (Room No. 44), Imphal - 795001

3.13 Budget and Accounts of the Commission:

The budget provision meant for the Manipur Information Commission is provided by the State Government under the Demand No. 3 - Secretariat and is published in the Budget book of the Government under Demand number as given below. The budget provision is meant mostly for payment of pay and allowances of State Chief Information Commissioner/ State Information Commissioners, Domestic Travel Expenses and Office Expenses only.

Details of allocation of budget and expenditure for the year 2023-24 are as follows :

(Rs. in lakhs)

Details Head				Budget provision for the year 2023-24	Expenditure 2023-24
Major Head	:	2220	- Information & Publicity		
Sub Major	:	60	- Others		
Minor	:	001	- Direction & Administration		
Sub Head	:	02	- Manipur Information Commission		
Detailed	:	00	- Detailed		
Object	:	01	- Salary	1,30,00,000/-	40,74,696/-
		11	- Domestic Travel Expenses	2,00,000/-	1,75,040/-
		13	- Office Expenses	24,00,000/-	18,33,156/-

3.14 Activities undertaken by the Commission during the year: -

i) The main function of the Commission is to hear the Second Appeals preferred to, and to enquire into the Complaints filed by the aggrieved parties. During the year 2023-24, the Manipur Information Commission received 90 Appeals and 13 complaints. Out of appeal cases including old pending and complaint cases 19 including old pending cases, 176 appeal and 9 complaint cases were disposed of during the period. The details of receipt and disposal of appeals and complaints by the Commission is given in **Chapter - 4** and **Chapter - 5** of this Report.

ii) The Commission, with funding of Rs. 3.00 lacs from the Department of Personnel & Public Grievances, Govt. of India, successfully celebrated the RTI Week from 5th to 10th October, 2023 with an objective of making the citizens and the Public Authorities aware of the various provisions of the Act. The highlights of the RTI Week celebration was an opening ceremony held on 5th October 2023 at Auditorium Hall of DIPR, Imphal, followed by a workshop on various aspects of the Act. On 6th October, 2023, a State level Painting Competition was organized in association with Manipur University of Culture, Imphal and a District Level Seminar was organised at the office of Deputy Commissioner, Kakching on 9th October, 2023. The prize distribution and valedictory function was organised on 10th October, 2023 at Manipur Press Club, Majorkhul, Imphal.

iii) The Commission also undertook steps for giving training-cum-awareness programmes in respect of officers and officials of Department and citizens with funding from the State Government during 2023-24. The details of the training-cum-awareness programmes by the Commission during 2023-24 as follows.

Sl. No.	Date	Name of Department	Place/ Venue	Funding
1	2	3	4	5
1.	20-10-2023	Manipur Information Commission	Conference Hall, Manipur Press Club, Major Khun, Imphal	State
2.	16-01-2024	Manipur Information Commission	Training Hall, State Academy of Training, Takyelpat	State
3.	07-02-2024	Manipur Information Commission	Training Hall, State Academy of Training, Takyelpat	State

iv) During the year, the Commission has taken part in various programmes organized by the others State Information Commission and the Central Information Commission as follows :

Date	Place	Nature of Programme
10-05-2023	Assam	North East Information Commissioners' Conference organized by Assam Information Commission.
08-09-2023 10-09-2023	Andhra Pradesh	28th Board of Governors and 12th Annual General Body meeting of NFICI at Visakhapatnam
02-02-2024 04-02-2024	Odisha	29th Board of Governors meeting of NFICI at Bhubaneswar under the aegis of State Information Commission, Odisha



Oath taking Ceremony of Shri Koijam Radhashyam Singh as State Chief Information Commissioner, Manipur by Hon'ble Governor of Manipur



Group photo after swearing-in-ceremony at Raj Bhawan, Imphal



Shri Oinam Sunil Singh, State Chief Information Commissioner, Manipur Information Commission speaking during RTI Week-2023 Celebration.



M.H. Khan, IAS, Additional Chief Secretary, Govt. of Manipur speaking during RTI Week-2023 Celebration.



Shri Awangbow Newmai, Hon'ble Minister (WR/Relief & DM) speaking during RTI Week-2023 Celebration.



Invitees / Participants of the Inaugural Ceremony of RTI Week-2023



Shri Rinku Khumukcha, Editor, Imphal Times, speaking as Resource Person during State Level Workshop as part of the RTI Week-2023.



Participants of the RTI Painting Competition during the RTI Week Celebration-2023 at Manipur University of Culture, Imphal.



Distribution of Certificate and prizes to Prize Winners of RTI Painting Competition-2023 by the Chief Guest Shri Khongbantabam Ibomcha, Hon'ble MLA, Lamlai A/C



Distribution of Certificate and prizes to Prize Winners of RTI Painting Competition-2023 by Shri Oinam Sunil Singh, State Chief Information Commissioner, Manipur Information Commission

CHAPTER IV

DISPOSAL OF COMPLAINTS BY THE STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

4.1. Section 18 (1) of the RTI Act, 2005, empowers the State Information Commission to receive and inquire into a complaint from any person:

a) Who has been unable to submit a request to any Public Information Officer, either by reason that no such officer has been appointed under this Act or because the State Assistant Public Information Officer has refused to accept his or her application for information or appeal under this Act for forwarding the same to the State Public Information Officer or a Senior Officer specified in Sub-Section (1) of Section 19 or the State Information Commission.

b) Who has been refused access to any information requested under this Act.

c) Who has not been given a response to a request for information or access to information within the time limit specified under this Act.

d) Who has been required to pay an amount of fee which he or she considers unreasonable.

e) Who believes that he or she has been given incomplete, misleading or false information under this Act; and

f) In respect of any matter relating to requesting or obtaining access to records under this Act.

4.2 While inquiring into such complaint under the above section, the State Information Commission shall have the same Powers as that of the Civil Court under the Code of Civil procedure, 1908 in respect of the following matters namely:

a) Summoning and enforcing attendance of Persons to give evidence or produce documents;

b) Requiring the discovery and inspection of documents;

c) Receiving evidence on affidavit;

d) Requisitioning any Public record or copies thereof from any court or office;

e) Issuing summons for examination of witnesses or documents and

f) Any other matter which may be prescribed.

Complaint Cases during 2023-24

Complaints pending as on 01-04-2023	Complaints received during the year	Total Complaints heard during the year	Total Complaints disposed	Percentage of disposal
6	13	19	9	47%

4.3 An analysis of the 13 complaints received by the Commission during 2023-24 revealed that 69% of the total complaints was filed against 2 Departments. The MSRRDA (RED) and Revenue (Land Resource) received highest complaints respectively.

The following Table IV shows Department-wise Complaints received and disposed during the year 2023-24.

TABLE - IV

DEPARTMENT/PUBLIC AUTHORITIES-WISE RECEIPT AND DISPOSAL OF COMPLAINT DURING 2023-24

Sl. No.	Name of Department	Total Complaint received	Disposed during the year	Undisposed (Balance)
1.	Education(S)	1	1	-
2.	Land Resources	2	1	1
3.	Manipur State Commission for Women	1	1	-
4.	Asian International University	1	1	-
5.	MSRRDA/RED	7	-	7
6.	PWD	1	-	1
		13	4	9

CHAPTER - V

HEARING AND DISPOSAL OF SECOND APPEALS BY THE COMMISSION

5.1. Another important function of the State Information Commission is to receive and hear appeals preferred by the Information seekers against the PIOs and designated First Appellate Authorities (FAA). Section 19 of the RTI Act, 2005 provides that:

(1) Any person who, does not receive a decision within the time specified in sub-section (1) or clause (a) of sub-section (3) of Section 7, or is aggrieved by a decision of the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officers, as the case may be, may within thirty days from the expiry of such period or from the receipt of such a decision prefer an appeal to such officer who is senior in rank to the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer as the case may be, in each public authority.

Provided that such officer may admit the appeal after the expiry of the period of thirty days if he or she is satisfied that the appellant was prevented by sufficient cause from filing the appeal in time.

(2) Where an appeal is preferred against an order made by the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, under Section 11 to disclose third party information, the appeal by the concerned third party shall be made within thirty days from the date of the order.

(3) A second appeal against the decision under sub-section (1) shall lie within ninety days from the date on which the decision should have been made or was actually received, with the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission.

Provided that the Central Information Commission or the State Information, as the case may be, may admit the appeal after the expiry of the period of ninety days if it is satisfied that the appellant was prevented by sufficient cause from filing the appeal in time.

(4) If the decision of the Central Public Information or State Public Information Officer as the case may be, against which an appeal is preferred relates to information of a third party, the Central Information Commission or State Information Commission, as the case may be, shall give a reasonable opportunity of being heard to that third party.

(5) In any appeal proceedings, the onus to prove that a denial of a request was justified shall be on the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, who denied the request.

(6) An appeal under sub-section (1) or sub-section (2) shall be disposed of within thirty days of the receipt of the appeal or within such extended period not exceeding a total of forty-five days from the date of filing thereof, as the case may be, for reasons to be recorded in writing.

(7) The decision of the Central Information Commission or State Information Commission, as the case may be, shall be binding.

(8) In its decision, the Central Information Commission or State Information Commission, as the case may be, has the power to –

(a) Require the public authority to take any such steps as may be necessary to secure compliance with the provisions of this Act, including–

(i) by providing access to information, if so requested, in a particular form;

(ii) by appointing a Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be;

(iii) by publishing certain information or categories of information;

(iv) by making necessary changes to its practices in relation to the maintenance, management and destruction of records;

(v) by enhancing the provision of training on the right to information for its officials;

(vi) by providing it with an annual report in compliance with clause (b) of sub-section (1) of Section 4;

(b) Require the public authority to compensate the complainant for any loss or other detriment suffered;

(c) Impose any of the penalties provided under this Act;

(d) Reject the application.

5.2 During the year 2023-24, 90 Appeal petitions were received by the Commission and 129 appeal cases were carried forward from the previous year.

The following Table shows Department-wise received and disposal of Second appeal cases during the year 2023-24.

Appeal Cases during 2023-24

Appeals pending as 01-04-2023	Appeals received during the year	Total Appeals heard during the year	Total Appeals disposed	Percentage of disposal
129	90	219	176	80%

5.3 An analysis of the 90 second appeals received by the Commission during 2023-24 reveals that 38% of the total second appeals are related to only 4 Departments namely Land Resource with 16 second appeal, Education(S) with 7 second appeal, Sangai International University with 6 second appeal and Social Welfare with 6 second appeal.

The percentage of second appeals filed before the Commission as compared to the total number of RTI applications filed during the year and the first appeals filed before the First Appellate Authorities are 16% and 90% respectively. The reasons for high percentage of RTI petitioners approaching the Commission may be due to under reporting of total RTI petitions filed to SPIOs during the year as many SPIOs failed to submit their data/ reports for preparing the Annual Report to the Commission.

The Department-wise number of Second Appeals received and disposed during the year 2023-24 is as shown in **Table -V**.

TABLE - V
DEPARTMENT-WISE RECEIPT AND DISPOSAL OF SECOND APPEALS DURING 2023-24

Sl. No.	Name of Department	Total Appeal received	Disposed during the year	Undisposed (Balance)
1.	Asian International University	2	2	-
2.	BOSEM	2	-	2
3.	COHSEM	3	-	3
4.	Cooperation	1	-	1
5.	CAF & PD	1	1	-
6.	DP & AR	5	5	-
7.	DRDA	2	2	-
8.	Education(S)	7	5	2
9.	Forest & Environment	1	1	-
10.	Governor Secretariat	1	1	-
11.	Health & Family Welfare	4	3	1
12.	Higher & Tech. Education	5	2	3
13.	Home	2	-	2
14.	Manipur Legislative Assembly	2	1	1
15.	MAHUD	3	2	1
16.	MBCWWB	1	-	1
17.	MOBED	1	-	1
18.	M	1	1	-
19.	MPSC	2	2	-
20.	MSRRDA/RED	2	1	1
21.	Power	2	2	-
22.	RD & PR	1	1	-
23.	Land Resources	16	16	-
24.	PHED	1	-	1
25.	Water Resources	1	1	-
26.	Sangai International University	6	6	-
27.	Social Welfare	6	6	-
28.	TA & Hills	2	1	1
29.	Treasury	1	1	-
30.	Vety & A.H.	1	1	-
31.	Works	2	2	-
32.	Samagraha Siksha	2	-	2
33.	YAS	1	-	1
	Total	**90**	**66**	**24**

CHAPTER - VI

Penalties, Disciplinary Action and Compensation

(Section 20 (1) & (2) and 19(8)(b) of the RTI Act, 2005)

6.1. The State Information Commission under Section 19 (8)(c) is empowered to impose penalties in accordance with the provisions laid down under the Act. Section 20 (1) of the Act, provides that "where the Central Information Commission or State Information Commission" as the case may be, at the time of deciding any complaint or appeal is of the opinion that the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, has without any reasonable cause refused to receive an application for information or has not furnished the information within the time specified under sub-section (1) of Section 7 or malafidely denied the request for information or knowingly given incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or destroyed information, which was the subject of the request or obstructed in any manner in furnishing the information, it shall impose a penalty of two hundred and fifty rupees each day till application is received or information is furnished, so however the total amount of such penalty shall not exceed twenty five thousand rupees;

Provided that the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, shall be given a reasonable opportunity of being heard before any penalty is imposed on him;

Provided further that the burden of proving that he acted reasonably and diligently shall be on the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be.

While exercising the above power, in every case, the Commission gives an opportunity to the SPIO by issuing a Show Cause notice to him/ her, asking to explain as to why penalty under Section 20 (1) shall not be imposed against him/ her for violation of the provisions of the RTI Act, 2005. After giving him/her an opportunity of being heard and after detailed examination and consideration of all the papers and documents available and produced before the Commission and in case the Commission is convinced and satisfied that the SPIO has contravened the law, the Commission imposed penalty on them.

In case the Commission is satisfied with any claim of the complainant/ appellant that a loss or detriment has been caused to him by the delay in providing the information, the Commission also direct the Public Authority to compensate the complainant/ appellant under section 19(8)(b) of the RTI Act, 2005.

6.2. The Commission in exercise of the above power has imposed the following penalties as indicated in Table-VI

Table-VI

Sl. No.	Case No	Name of the Complainant/ Appellant	Name of SPIO/ Public Authority	Amount of Penalty/ Compensation
1.	A/4/MIC-2023	N. Nodiachand Singh	Education(S)	Rs. 2,000/- (Compensation)
2.	A/96/MIC-2022	W. Joykumar Singh	CAF & PD	Rs. 5,000/- (Compensation)
3.	A/57/MIC-2022	Aribam Jankinath Sharma	Revenue Department	Rs. 20,000/- (Compensation)

CHAPTER - VII

RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the operational constraints faced by the Commission in effectively discharging its statutory responsibilities under the Right to Information Act, 2005, the following recommendations are made for consideration and necessary action by the State Government and other concerned authorities.

1. Establishment of a permanent office building : The Commission is presently functioning from a temporary accommodation, which lacks adequate space essential infrastructure. In order to enhance the functional efficiency and dignity of the institution, it is strongly recommended that a dedicated and suitability equips office building be constructed for the Manipur Information Commission. The proposed building should include adequate office spaces, record rooms, meeting halls, video conferencing Court room and others amenities.
2. Implementation of Suo Motu Disclosure under Section 4 of the RTI Act : Dispute the clear mandate under Section 4 of the RTI Act, 2005 and Hon'ble Supreme Court direction issued in connection with W.P (C) No. 990 of 2021, many public authorities in the State have failed to implement proactive disclosure norms. The Commission recommends that the State Government issue directions to all Departments to fully comply with the requirement of Suo Motu Disclosure, including appointment of Nodal Officers and regular audit of disclosure by 3rd party agencies. Strict time line should be enforced, and compliance should be monitored periodically.

3. Strengthening capacity building and training measure : There is an urgent need for regular capacity building programme for SPIO and FAA staffs of public authorities. The Commission recommends collaboration with Administrative Training Institute (ATI) and other agencies for structured training modules and workshop on RTI related practices, digital governance and grievances handling.

4. Enhancing public awareness and outreach activities effective implementation of the RTI Act hinges on public awareness and citizen participation. The Commission recommends that awareness campaigns be conducted through out the State, specially in rural and remote area, trainings materials, local media, street play, social media platform and communities based programme. School and colleges should also be involved to inculcate the culture of transparency and accountability from an early age.

5. Budgetary support and autonomy : The Commission urges the state government to provide adequate and timely financial resource to support its activities and ensure institutional autonomy as envisaged under the RTI Act, 2005.

***

ANNEXURE

Appeal Case No. 16, 19 & 22 of 2023

Kh. Robindro Singh & Ors. – Appellants.
-Vs-
The SPIO/ Deputy Secretary. (MPSC) & Anr. – Respondents.

JUDGEMENT
Dated: - 28.4.2023

The SPIO, MPSC is present. The two appellants are represented by Shri K. Kishan Singh, Advocate. Shri Kh. Robindro Singh, the third appellant is absent.

All the three appeal cases are analogous. As such, the appeal cases No. 16, 19 & 22 are clubbed together.

Brief Facts of the Case:

The three applicants/ appellants viz., Ms. Begum Khaleda Bogie, Mr. Nawaj Sharif & Shri Robindro Singh filed their respective RTI applications on 24.11.2022, 1.12.2022 and 8.12.2022 to the SPIO/ Deputy Secretary, MPSC, seeking information in connection with the Manipur Civil Services Combine Competitive (Mains) Examination 2016 held in the year 2022, i.e., from 26th May 2022 to 11th June 2022 under Section 6 (1) of the RTI Act, 2005.

The SPIO (MPSC) had replied to the appellants stating that the MPSC has a policy decision not to furnish answer scripts mechanically for descriptive type papers under normal circumstances. Being aggrieved on the response of the public authority, the above appellants filed their respective 1st appeals to the Secretary, MPSC under Section 19 (1) of the RTI Act, 2005.

Lastly, the appellants filed their respective 2nd appeals to the Commission under Section 19 (3) of the RTI Act, 2005. Hence, the present appeal cases.

Proceedings of the Case:

On the day of hearing on 23.3.2023, the SPIO (MPSC) is directed to furnish respective written objection/ statements of the present appeal cases to the Commission with copies endorsed to the present appellants.

On the day of hearing on 30.3.2023, the SPIO (MPSC) handed over the respective written statements to the appellants. The appellants also acknowledged receipt of the same. The appellants further prayed the Commission to grant

some more days for filing written rejoinders/ statements. Accordingly, the Commission advised the appellants to file their written statements/ rejoinders within 10 days with copy endorsed to the SPIO (MPSC) without fail.

On the day of last hearing on 19.4.2023, the SPIO (MPSC) submitted three sets of rejoinders/ counter affidavits to the statements/ rejoinders of the three appellants (filed on 4.4.2023, 5.4.2023 & 19.4.2023) to the Commission. A similar set of the copies were also handed over to the appellants during the hearing. The appellants also acknowledged receipt of the same.

The appellants however, refuted the reply of the SPIO (MPSC) which stated that the answer sheet cannot be provided in normal circumstances. They asked the public authority under what circumstances it can be provided. The appellant also strongly opposed the comparison of MPSC with UPSC. They argued that the MPSC is conducting the said examination within the limited jurisdiction of Manipur, whereas UPSC conducts examination on all India basis for a huge number of candidates in the highest form of standard. It is wrong to compare horizontal institutions like MPSC with vertical institution like UPSC. As such, the appellants prayed the Commission to issue a direction to the MPSC to allow inspection of their respective written answer scripts even though the public authority has denied them to collect the certified copies of their answer scripts.

The SPIO (MPSC) argued that the inspection of answer scripts/ books was not requested in their original RTI applications. He stated that a new amendment of their earlier prayers may have changed in the nature and structure of the RTI applications and it is unacceptable and impermissible under the Act. He further submitted that the policy decision of the Manipur Public Service Commission is/ are now challenged by some petitioners at the Manipur High Court. And, the same writ petitions filed by different petitioners are still pending in the Hon'ble Manipur High Court. As such, he submitted that it is res-subjudice as envisage under Section 10 of the Civil Procedure of Code.

Observation and Judgement:

Upon hearing from both parties and perusal of the entire case records in the files, the Commission observes that the aim and objective of the RTI Act, 2005 is to bring transparency and accountability for bringing good governance in the State. The Commission here wants to put on record that highest form of transparency in conducting examination relating to recruitment in Manipur is maintained by the Hon'ble High Court of Manipur. Recently, under this RTI Act,

2005, the Registrar, (Judicial), Hon'ble High Court of Manipur has provided certified copies of answer-sheet of main examination for appointment of Manipur Judicial Services, Grade -I as asked for by one applicant in an RTI application. This shows that there is transparency in the appointment of Judges in the examination conducted by Hon'ble High Court of Manipur. As the Hon'ble High Court of Manipur has set the trend, the MPSC is expected to follow it. As such, the public authority of the MPSC shall give up its old mind set of the erstwhile British rule in India. This 21st Century is an era of information age. The Commission also observes that the main issue faced by the MPSC is the lack of public trust. The MPSC is expected to work towards regaining the public trust besides conducting its examinations in professional manner. And, allowing inspection of answer scripts will be a step towards wining public trust. The Commission further observes that the interpretation of the word 'information', also include inspection of records. There is no question of additional information as claimed by the public authority. On further examination as alleged by public authority, there is no question of res-subjudice in providing the sought information as there is no specific direction given by the Hon'ble High Court of Manipur to bar the information. In number of instances, the public authority of the MPSC has allowed inspection of records or documents as asked by the applicants/ appellants. In an earlier RTI case, the MPSC had allowed to inspect answer scripts in the Manipur Combined Engineering Services (Written) Examination, 2013 for recruitment of Assistant Engineers held on 2013 as asked by an RTI applicant.

Accordingly, the Commission directs the SPIO (MPSC) to allow the three appellants to inspect/ examine all their respective answer sheets for MCSCC mains examination- 2016, held in the year 2022 (i.e., from 26th May 2022 to 11th June, 2022) within 4 weeks from today.

With this direction the appeal cases are disposed of.

Announced in open Chamber.

Sd/-
(O. Sunil Singh)
State Chief Information Commissioner,
Manipur Information Commission.

Appeal Case No. 40 of 2023

Shri Th. Arunkumar Singh —Appellant

-vs-

The SPIO/ Department of Forest & Environment
Govt. of Manipur & Anr. —Respondents

For the FAA/ SPIO:	Shri N. Somorendro Singh, WPSO.
For the Appellant:	In person.
Date of hearings:	11-07-2023, 27-07-2023, 17-08-2023 & 13-09-2023.
Date of decision:	27-09-2023

DECISION

The Appellant who was an unselected candidate in the Forests Recruitment Examination on 27-11-2016 had sought certified evaluated OMR answer sheets, question booklets and answer keys of his written exam from the SPIO vide his RTI application dated 26-12-2022. And, getting no information from the SPIO within the mandated period of 30 (thirty) days, the Appellant filed his First Appeal to the FAA/ Chief Conservator of Forest and HOFF, Govt. of Manipur on 14-02-2023 and the present second appeal application to this Commission on 11-04-2023.

The case was heard on 11-07-2023, 27-07-2023, 17-08-2023 and 13-09-2023. During the course of the hearing, the Appellant pressed for providing his answer key (Roll No. 3979) and also to access the original copies of his answer sheet along with original copies of proceedings of the viva-voce test. However, the SPIO submitted and clarified that the answer key was already provided on the official website of the department as well as at the notice board in time. But the old official website was replaced by a new one and in the process, old records were lost. He also submitted that despite his best effort, the said answer key is not traceable.

However, the Public Authority welcome the Appellant's request and allowed him to inspect his answer sheets/ records. Being the situation, the Commission vide decision dated 27-07-2023 directed the SPIO to find out the said answer key and further advised the SPIO to file an affidavit, if the same could not be

found in his official custody. The Commission also directs the SPIO and the Appellant to have a joint inspection of records.

In compliance with the said direction of the Commission, the SPIO vide application dated 16-08-2023, had submitted an affidavit and inter alia stated that "Answer Key" of the Forests Recruitment Examination, 2016 held on 27/11/2016 pursuant to this office Advertisement No. MFFR/2016, dated 16-08-2016 was not traceable/ found in the office of the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests & Head of Forest Force, Govt. of Manipur.

The SPIO also submitted that the Appellant failed to turn up for the joint inspection of records. In pursuant to the direction of this Commission dated 19-08-2023, the SPIO submitted his written explanation dated 12-09-2023 and clarified the reasons for the delay in providing the available information/ reply to the Appellant.

After hearing of both the parties and perusal of case records, the Commission finds that no malafide intention on the part of the SPIO for the delay in providing the available information/ reply to the Appellant. Hence, no penalty under section 20 (1) & (2) of the RTI Act, 2005 is imposed against the SPIO. However, the Public Authority represented by the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, Govt. of Manipur is advised to take appropriate steps for maintaining all office records safely under the custody of the Public Authority and also to take appropriate action against the responsible officers/ officials for the lost of office records, if any.

With the above observation and advice, the appeal case is closed.

Announced in the open chamber.

(O. Sunil Singh)
State Chief Information Commissioner,
Manipur Information Commission.

Appeal Case No. 4 of 2023

N. Nodiachand Singh – Appellant

-vs-

The SPIO/Addl. Director (Grievance Cell)/ Education (S), Govt. of Manipur & Anr. – Respondents

For FAA/ SPIO	:	Shri Y. Nongdrenkhomba, OSD (Legal).
For the Appellant	:	In Person
Date of hearings	:	28-02-2023, 23-03-2023, 12-04-2023, 03-05-2023 and 24-07-2023.
Date of Decision	:	29-08-2023.

ORDERS

The FFA and SPIO are represented by Shri Y. Nongdrenkhomba, OSD (Legal). The Appellant is also present.

Fact of the case: The appellant had filed his RTI application dated 31-08-2022 to the SPIO/ Addl. Director (GC), Directorate of Education(s), Govt. of Manipur and sought certain information relating to the details of the teachers appointed in reference to 46/18/2017-ED (G) Pt. of the year 2019 and the year 2021 along with information related to the application dated 27-06-2022. Getting no information/ reply from the SPIO, the Appellant filed his first appeal to the First Appellate Authority (FAA)/ Director of Education (S), Govt. of Manipur on 31-10-2022 and then second appeal to this Commission on 06-01-2023.

The case was heard on 28-02-2023, 23-03-2023, 12-04-2023, 03-05-2023 and 24-07-2023. On 14-03-2023, the Appellant submitted an application and stated that he had received the information and documents from the SPIO/ Addl. Director (GC) only on 13-03-2023 which are contrary to section 7 and 19 (6) of the RTI Act, 2005 and pressed for taking necessary action against the SPIO/ Respondents.

The Commission also passed an order on 12-04-2023 and issued show cause notice to the SPIO. And, the SPIO in her reply dated 11-07-2023 stated that there was no malafide intention in the delay in furnishing the information as the information sought by the Appellant was voluminous and it was not possible

to provide it within the stipulated time. She also highlighted the prevailing law and order situation for the said delay.

Decision: After hearing of both the parties and perusal of case records, the Commission observed that the SPIO/ Addl. Director (GC), Directorate of Education (S) has admitted the delay of 6 (six) months and 11 (eleven) days in providing the information to the Appellant. But there was no malafide intention on part of the SPIO as the State witnessed an unprecedented law and order problem. But, for the detriment suffered by the Appellant in attending the Commission for accessing the information, the Commission directs the Public Authority represented by the Director of Education (S), Govt. of Manipur to compensate the Appellant with an amount of Rs. 2,000/- (Rupees two thousand) only as per section 19 (8) (b) of the RTI Act, 2005 within a period of 1 (one) month from the date of receipt of this order and intimate the compliance report to this Commission within 45 (forty-five) days from today.

With the above observation and direction, the appeal case is closed.

Announced in the open chamber.

Sd/-
(O. Sunil Singh)
State Chief Information Commissioner,
Manipur Information Commission

Appeal Case No. 24 of 2023

Shri Th. Tomba Singh – Appellant

-vs-

The SPIO/ Manipur Technical University, Manipur &Anr. – Respondents

For FAA/ SPIO: - Shri L. Rajesh. Advocate.
For the Appellant: - In Person
Date of hearings: - 30-03-2023, 05-04-2023, 21-04-2023, 14-07-2023 and 28-07-2023
Date of Decision: - 31-08-2023.

DECISION

The Respondents are represented by Shri L. Rajesh, Advocate. The Appellant is also present.

The Appellant, in connection with the recent recruitment of Assistant Professors by the Manipur Technical University, Imphal, vide recruitment adv. No. 2/3/2016/MTU dated 08-02-2021 had sought certain information regarding names, designation, affiliation and educational qualifications of the selection committee members at the time of interview on the format prepared by the Appellant for all the interviews conducted for the recruitment of Assistant Professor in 5 (five) Engineering Departments, Management, Mathematics, Physics, Professional Communication, Psychology and Biological Sciences vide RTI application dated 21-10-2022.

The Appellant also sought proceedings of the minutes and criteria for the nomination of the expert member/ selection committee member/ DPC member, for all the interviews conducted in connection with the recruitment of Assistant Professor in 5 (five) Engineering Departments, Management, Mathematics, Physics, Professional of Communication, Psychology and Biological Sciences. Thereafter, getting no response from the SPIO within the mandated period of 30 (thirty) days, the Appellant filed his first appeal application to the First Appellant Authority (FAA) of the Manipur Technical University (MTU) vide application dated 03-12-2022.

The FAA/ Registrar, MTU has taken up the first appeal and passed an order on 23-12-2022 by rejecting the information under section 8 (1) (j) of the RTI Act, 2005 on the reasons that the information being sought by the Appellant is third party/ personal information which will not serve any public interest. Moreover, the disclosure of the same would cause an unwarranted invasion of privacy to the members of the selection committee. Against the said decision of the FAA, the Appellant filed the present second appeal on 01-03-2023.

During the hearing on 28-07-2023, the FAA/ SPIO submitted his written statement that the information that is exempted from disclosure under the RTI Act, 2005 cannot be furnished to the Appellant. And, as such, the Appellant cannot claim such information which is exempted from disclosure under the Act as a matter of right.

However, the Appellant denied the statements made by the Respondents and submitted that the information sought by the Appellant is of public interest and the order of the FAA is liable to be set aside. He also submitted that the information which cannot be denied to the Parliament or the State Legislative shall not be denied to any person as per the provision under section 8 (1) of the RTI Act, 2005.

After hearing of both the parties and perusal of the case records, the Commission finds no mistake on the part of the FAA/ Registrar, Manipur Technical University while rejecting the information sought by the Appellant. Hence, the Commission is inclined to the decision of the FAA dated 23-12-2022.

With the above observation and decision, the appeal case is disposed of.

Announced in the open chamber.

Sd/-
(O. Sunil Singh)
State Chief Information Commissioner,
Manipur Information Commission.

Appeal Case No. 60 of 2023

Khulakpam Akhtar Hussian – Appellant.

-Vs-

The SPIO/ MPSC & Anr. – Respondents.

JUDGEMENT

Dated: - 31.8.2023

Shri N. Tejkumar Singh, SPIO (MPSC) is present. The appellant is also present.

Brief facts the Case:

One Shri Khulakpam Akhtar Hussian filed an RTI application on 1.12.2022 to the SPIO, Manipur Public Service Commission seeking information on 4 points regarding Manipur Civil Services Combined Competitive (Mains) Examination, 2016 held in the year 2022 from 26th May to 11th June, 2022 under Section 6 (1) of the RTI Act, 2005. The public authority furnished the information on query 1, 2 & 3 of the RTI application, except for query No. 4, direct to the appellant. Thereafter, the appellant filed the 1st Appeal on 12.1.2023 to the FAA/ Secretary, MPSC under Section 19 (1) of the said Act. The FAA/ MPSC passed a decision/ order on 10.2.2023 with an observation that the decision of the SPIO (MPSC) not to provide front page of the Appellant's answer sheets is upheld. Against the order of the FAA (MPSC), the appellant once again filed 2nd Appeal on 4.7.2023 to the Commission under Section 19 (3) of the RTI Act, 2005.

Hence, the case.

Summary of the Hearings:

On the day of hearing dated 1.8.2023, the public authority submitted that the sought information is analogous with the decision/ judgement of the Commission passed in Appeal Case No. 16, 19 & 22 of 2023. The impugned judgement passed by the Commission on 28.4.2023 has been stayed by an interim order dated 27.6.2023 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Manipur in WP (C) No. 474 of 2023.

Observation:

The Commission further observes that in the light of the above factual position, the Commission is not in a position to take up further proceedings on the appeal case.

However, a liberty is granted to the appellant to file a fresh RTI application after the final outcome of the said writ petition at the Hon'ble Manipur High Court.

With this observation, the appeal case is disposed of.

Sd/-
(O. Sunil Singh)
State Chief Information Commissioner,
Manipur Information Commission.

Appeal Case No. 27 of 2023

P.T. Graceson –Appellant.

-Vs-

The SPIO/ Deputy Secretary (Works), Govt. of Manipur & Anr.

– Respondents.

JUDGEMENT

Dated: - 4.9.2023

Ms. Regina Hongray, SPIO/ Joint Secretary (Works), Govt. of Manipur and Ms. Awungshi Suhaini, SO (Works) are present. The appellant is also present.

Brief Facts of the Case:

One Mr. P.T. Graceson, constable No. 1901328, Imphal West filed an RTI application on 29.11.2022 to the SPIO/ Joint Secretary (Works) seeking information on 4 (four) points in connection with allotment of Government quarters. The appellant filed the 1st appeal on 13.1.2023 to the FAA/ Commissioner (Works), Govt. of Manipur under Section 19 (1) of the RTI Act. Thereafter, the appellant filed the 2nd Appeal on 14.3.2023 to the Commission under Section 19 (3) of the RTI Act, 2005.

Hence, the case.

Summary of the Case Hearings:

On the day of hearing on 6.4.2023, the SPIO (Works) submitted that the required information had already been furnished direct to the appellant. The appellant submitted that he has received information on query 1, 3 & 4 from the concerned public authority. He expressed his satisfaction with the said information. However, he claimed that he was not pleased with the reply on query No. 2. He pressed the public authority to furnish information on query No. 2. Upon hearing from both the parties, the Commission is of the view that the Commission is not empowered to change any decision taken by an administrative Department. As such, the Commission directs the SPIO (PWD) to bring the file related to query No. 2 before the next hearing, so as to examine whether the said information is disclosable or not.

On the day of hearing on 25.4.2023, the Commission has closely examined the relevant government files/ records placed before the Commission in connection with the allotment of government quarters which is pertinent to RTI query No. 2 of the present appeal case. The Commission observes that the note sheet No. 74 and its subsequent administrative decision as reflected at page 79 of the said file which was adopted/ recommended by the House Allotment Committee meeting held on 16.11.2022 are all disclosable information. Hence, the Commission directs the SPIO/ Joint Secretary (Works), Government of Manipur to furnish the certified copies of the said note sheet No. 74 and its subsequent administrative decision as reflected at page 79 of the government file after blackening the signature of the members of the Allotment Committee direct to the appellant on the day of the next hearing positively.

On the day of last hearing on 12.7.2023, the public authority placed the left out information to the Commission. On that day, the appellant did not turn up because of law and order situation. As such, the public authority is unable to hand over the said information to the appellant. However, the appellant was informed over the phone to collect the said information from the Commission. The appellant also assured the Commission that he will collect the same after a week. The appellant has failed to collect the said information till date.

Observation:

Upon perusal of the facts and circumstances of the case, the Commission advised the Deputy Registrar, Judicial-II, Manipur Information Commission either to send the aforementioned documents/ RTI information through speed post or by a special messenger to the address of the appellant within five days from today. With this direction, the present appeal case is disposed of.

Announced in open Chamber.

Sd/-
(O. Sunil Singh)
State Chief Information Commissioner,
Manipur Information Commission

Appeal Case No. 57 of 2022

Name of the appellant : Shri Aribam Jankinath Sharma
The First Appellate Authority : The Commissioner (Revenue)
Govt. of Manipur
The State Public Information Officer: a) The Deputy Commissioner, Kakching
b) The Directorate of Settlement & Land Records, Manipur
c) Shri P. Yaitongba Singh, deemed SPIO/ DSLR
d) The deemed SPIO, Shri Ibohal Singh, AS & SO- XII, Kakching, Manipur.

JUDGEMENT

Dated: - 15.9.2023

Shri Lanjoy Thoudam, SPIO (Revenue), Government of Manipur, Shri P. Yaitongba Singh, SPIO (DSLR), Shri S. Hemanta Meitei, SDC (HQ), Kakching, and Shri H. Ibohal Singh, AS & SO, Kakching are present. The appellant is also present.

Brief Facts of the Case:

One Shri Aribam Jankinath Sharma filed an RTI application on 16.3.2022 to the SPIO/ Deputy Commissioner, Kakching seeking information on 4 (four) points in connection with a homestead land of Revenue village No. 63 – Kakching Wairi, under Section 6 (1) of the RTI Act, 2005. Having failed to get the sought information from the SPIO, the appellant filed 1st Appeal on 2.5.2022 to the FAA/ Commissioner (Revenue), Government of Manipur under Section 19 (1) of the RTI Act. Thereafter, the appellant filed the 2nd Appeal to the Commission on 17.5.2022 under Section 19 (3) of the RTI Act, 2005. Hence, the appeal case.

Proceedings of the Case:

On the day of hearing dated **20.6.2022**, Shri S. Hemanta Meitei, SDC (HQ), Kakching submitted that the SPIO/ DC, Kakching had transferred the said RTI application to the Director (Settlement & Land Records) on 13th April, 2022. The SPIO (DSLR) submitted that he had already forwarded the said RTI application to the AS & SO – XII, Kakching on 27.4.2022. The Commission then

implead Shri Ibohal Singh, AS & SO – XII, Kakching as the deemed SPIO and further directs him to appear in person along with the required information before the Commission.

On the day of hearing dated 11.7.2022, the representative of the public authority, AS & SO, Kakching submitted an application stating that the public authority, AS & SO, Kakching is admitted in a Hospital for medical treatment. It also submitted the information on query No. I & II. The appellant submitted that he had already received the said information and he further demanded the information for query No. (III) & (IV). Upon hearing from both the parties, the Commission is of the view that the documents for hospitalisation as produced by the public authority, AS & SO, Kakching is not satisfactory. The Commission further directs the AS & SO, Kakching to furnish the information on query No. (III) & (IV) direct to the appellant within 3 weeks.

On the day of hearing dated 1.8.2022, the public authority prayed for some more days to furnish a written reply on the left out information. The appellant is absent and as such, the Commission could not collect his views and comments. The Commission also directs the AS & SO, Kakching to submit the necessary medical report of his admission to the hospital. The Commission also directs the deemed SPIO/AS & SO Kakching to furnish the left out information/ reply to the appellant.

On the day of hearing dated 23.8.2022, the appellant submitted to the Commission that he has received a letter dated 3.8.2022 from the AS & SO, Kakching, but he did not receive any information on queries No. (iii) & (iv). On perusal of the letter submitted by the public authority/ AS & SO, Kakching, the Commission found from his written statement that he could not find out any information in connection with the land conversion from Agricultural land to homestead land pertinent to queries (iii) & (iv). He also stated that there was no record reflected either in the Dag Chitha or Jamabandi regarding the allotment order issued by any competent authority. He further revealed that it was done by some of his predecessors who were serving as AS & SO, Kakching along with some staff. Lastly, he stated that it was a manipulation of records of rights done in collusion with some officials & staff serving during the relevant period.

Lastly, he prayed the Commission to conduct an inquiry against the said employees/ officers/ officials serving at the relevant period of time. From the above facts & circumstances, the Commission is of the opinion that initiation of an inquiry is required to find out the responsible officials/ staff involved on the alleged manipulation of records. Accordingly, the Commission directs the Commissioner (Revenue) Govt. of Manipur to conduct an inquiry to find out the person/ persons involved in the said record manipulation of public documents within 4 weeks. The Commission further directs the Commissioner (Revenue) to give an opportunity of being heard to the appellant during the said inquiry.

On the day of hearing dated **28.9.2022**, the appellant submitted that he has received the required information from the public authority and expressed his satisfaction. As the SPIO (Revenue) is absent despite notice served to him, the Commission could not collect his views/ comments on the said inquiry. The Commission then directs the SPIO (Revenue) to furnish the report of the inquiry ordered by the Commission in its decision dated 23.8.2022.

On the day of hearing dated **21.12.2022**, the public authority prayed for some more days to furnish the inquiry report in compliance with the Commission's decision passed on 23.8.2022. Accordingly, the Commission grants some more days as requested by the public authority.

On the day of last hearing on **18.1.2023**, Shri Lanjoy Thoudam, Deputy Secretary (Revenue) and Shri Mangoljao Kamei, Under Secretary (Revenue) assured the Commission that they will initiate an enquiry to find out the person/ persons involved in the said record manipulation of public documents and furnish the said report to the Commission within 4 (four) weeks. However, the public authorities have failed to furnish the said report even after 7 (seven) months. The Commission, however, received a letter on 2.2.2023 addressed to the Director, Settlement & Land Records with a request to furnish a detail report on the matter raised by Under Secretary (Revenue). Subsequently, the SPIO/ S & SO – I, DSLR furnish a written reply to the Secretary (Revenue) on 20.3.2023 with copy endorsed to the Commission. On minute reading of the said reply, the Commission found that the Department could not find any involvement of any person/ persons for manipulations of the said public records/ documents.

Observation and Judgement:

Upon hearing from both the parties and perusal of the entire case records/ documents in the file, the Commission is unhappy with the conduct of the public authorities in dealing with RTI matters and the failure to submit the inquiry report despite repeated directions to the concerned public authorities. The Department of Revenue has not furnished the final inquiry report to the Commission till date. While the appellant is satisfied with the said information, provided by AS & SO, Kakching, the case could not be closed because the public authorities of Revenue and DSLR could not submit the report of the inquiry ordered on 23.8.2022.

While Revenue Department in Secretariat asked for details from DSLR during the inquiry, the DSLR could not provide satisfactory information. Instead of pulling up the DSLR, the Revenue Department sat on the inquiry disregarding the Commission's directive. And in the meantime, creating detriment to the Appellant.

The Commission warns the Revenue Department not to repeat such act in future and obey the Commission's directive. As such, the Commission directs the Department of Revenue and the Directorate of Settlement and Land Records, Manipur to pay a sum of Rupees 10,000/- each (Rs. 20,000/- in total) to the appellant from any available Head of Account of their respective Departments as a compensation for the detriment suffered by the Appellant while pursuing the information, within 3 (three) weeks from today.

Sd/-
(O. Sunil Singh)
State Chief Information Commissioner,
Manipur Information Commission

Appeal Case No. 84 of 2023

Nanda Kumari Pandey –Appellant

-vs-

The SPIO/ Director, Treasury & Accounts, Manipur & Anr. – Respondents

DECISION

Imphal, 21st December, 2023

The FAA is represented by Shri A. Dayananda Singh, Deputy Secretary (Finance) whereas the SPIO, Shri Vivek Singh Elangbam, Director/ SPIO (Treasuries & Accounts), Manipur along with Shri Sushil Kumar Ningombam, Treasury Officer, Imphal West are present. The Appellant is also present.

The FAA has submitted his written statement dated 19-12-2023.

During the hearing, the SPIO placed a copy of the letter dated 18-12-2023 and submitted that as per direction of the Hon'ble High Court of Manipur dated 30-11-2023 passed in W.P. (C) No. 38 of 2022, the Disburser's portion of PPO SP/192 in respect of (Late) Shri Kumar Pandey had already been forwarded to the Principal Accountant General (A&E), Office of the Accountant General (A&E), Manipur vide letter No. 1/1/Try-IW/2022-2023 dated 18-12-2023. And, the Appellant was also already informed to collect the duplicate pension book on production of relevant documents identifying the relationship to the expired pensioner vide letter dated 14-12-2023 of the Treasury Officer, Imphal West.

After hearing the submission of the SPIO, both the parties agreed to provide duplicate pension book in respect Shri Kumar Pandey to the Appellant on production of relevant documents identifying the relationship to the expired pensioner and also agreed to close appeal proceedings.

Accordingly, the appeal case is closed.

Announced in the open chamber.

Sd/-
(K. Radhashyam Singh)
State Chief Information Commissioner
Manipur Information Commission

Appeal Case No. 43 of 2023

Shri N. Inaomacha Singh –Appellant

-vs-

The SPIO/ Director (Health), Govt. of Manipur & Anr. – Respondents

DECISION

Dated 21st December, 2023

The FAA and the SPIO are represented by Smt. N. Dhaneswori Devi, Legal Officer and Shri Kh. Babulindra Singh, Legal respectively. The Appellant is represented by Shri B. Prem Sharma, Advocate.

The present second appeal case was filed against the decision of the First Appellate Authority (FAA)/ Addl. Chief Secretary (Health & Family Welfare), Govt. of Manipur dated 06-02-2023. The Appellant in his appeal application stated that after expiry of specified time period, he received a response/ decision which were false, incomplete and misleading dated 23-01-2023 from the SAPIO/ Addl. Director (MD), Health Services Manipur on 29-01-2023.

The case was heard on 12-07-2023, 31-07-2023, 21-08-2023, 01-09-2023, 12-09-2023, 26-09-2023, 16-10-2023, 31-10-2023, 17-11-2023, 04-12-2023 and 21-12-2023.

During the course of hearing, both the parties agreed for the inspection of the relevant office records and on 01-09-2023, the Ld. Counsel of the Appellant submitted that only the compliance order which was sought in query No. 1 was left to be provided. The SPIO had provided the left-out information and additional information during the hearing on 12-09-2023, 16-10-2023 and 21-12-2023.

As agreed and assured by both the parties on 04-12-2023, the representative of the SPIO produced office files bearing No. Estt./Gr-IV/C-W/89-DHS for examination and a copy of letter No. G/Complaint.Case/2015-DHS dated 19-11-2018 (for query No. X) was furnished to the Appellant. However, the Ld. Counsel of the Appellant failed to produce Govt. O.M. dated 08-12-2005 purportedly issued by the Department of Personnel & Administrative Reforms (Personnel Division), Govt. of Manipur.

The Ld. Counsel of the Appellant strongly argued during the hearing on 21-12-2023 that in view of Para 4 of judgment and order dated 27-04-2026 passed by the

Hon'ble Guwahati High Court, Imphal Bench in W.P. (C) No. 68 of 2005, it is left to the competent authority i.e. Recruitment Authority to consider for giving weightage to the Petitioners for their contract appointment/ services for the fairly long period i.e. from January 1999 till the date of passing of the said judgement and order dated 27-04-2006 at the time they faced the selection/ DPC for the post of 26 Ward Attendants.

The representative of the SPIO submitted that all the submission of the Ld. Counsel of the Appellant is not related with the present RTI queries as the duty of the SPIO under the RTI Act is to provide only the information as available in the office records to the Appellant. And, all the available information had already been provided to the Appellant. He also submitted that there was no extension order of the Appellant after 10-12-2003 and the Appellant was informed vide information dated 19-11-2018 that the proposals made by the then Medical Superintendent, J.N. Hospital were not accepted by the Authority, since the contract engagement of the applicant/ appellant had not been extended w.e.f. 10-12-2003.

After hearing from both the parties and perusal of case records, the Commission is of the opinion that as all the available information had been provided to the Appellant and the inspection of office records had also been done by the Appellant, no further proceeding is called for.

With the above observation, the appeal case is disposed of.

Announce in the open chamber.

Sd/-

(K. Radhashyam Singh)
State Chief Information Commissioner
Manipur Information Commission

Appeal Case No. 11 of 2024

Md. Parvez Shah

–Appellant

-vs-

The SPIO/ E.O. Lilong Municipal Council, Thoubal District, Manipur & Anr.

– Respondents

DECISION

Imphal 22nd February, 2024

The FAA/ DC Thoubal and the FAA/ Director (MAHUD) are represented by Shri K. Prakash Singh, SDC (HQ) and Shri A. Tanganba, Assistant Director (MAHUD) respectively whereas the SPIO/ E.O, Lilong (TBL) Municipal Council is present. The Appellant is also present through video/ audio conference.

On perusal of case records, the Commission finds that the RTI application dated 27-11-2023 is written in Manipuri Language using "Roman Scripts" and not in Bengali or Meitei Mayek. As per the Manipur Official Language (Amendment) Act, 2021, the Manipur Language should be written either in Bengali or Meitei Mayek.

Hence, the second appeal is rejected with an advice to the Appellant to approach the concerned authority as per section 6 (1) of the RTI Act, 2005 afresh.

Sd/-

(K. Radhashyam Singh)

State Chief Information Commissioner

Manipur Information Commission

Appeal Case No. 19 of 2024

Shri Abhishek Dhoke – Appellant

-vs-

The SPIO/ Sangai International University, Manipur &Anr. – Respondents

DECISION

Dated 28th February, 2023

The present second appeal application was filed by Shri Abhishek Dhoke of Thane before the Central Information Commission (CIC), New Delhi against the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO), Manipur Information Commission. The Deputy Registrar (CR-I), CIC vide his letter dated 02-02-2024 had forwarded the said second appeal to the Secretary, Manipur Information Commission.

On perusal of the relevant case/ office records, the Commission finds that the Appellant had filed his RTI application dated 28-09-2023 to Public Information Officer, Sangia International University, Churachandpur, Manipur by post on 06-10-2023. Thereafter, the Appellant submitted his first appeal application dated Nil addressed to the CPIO, Manipur State Information Commission instead of submitting to the FAA of the Sangia International University.

The SPIO/ Deputy Registrar (Judl – I) of this Commission vide letter dated 03-01-2024 inform the Appellant to submit his first appeal application direct to the FAA of the concerned Public Authority (Sangia International University). And, the Appellant was also informed to approach this Commission by way of second appeal under section 19 (3) of the RTI Act, 2005 or as a Complaint under section 18 of the Act.

However, in contrary to the said intimation of this Commission dated 03-01-2024, the Appellant filed the present second appeal application under section 19 (3) of the RTI Act, 2005 without filing his first appeal application to the FAA of the concerned public authority which is mandatory requirement under section 19 (3) of the Act. Hence, the second appeal application is rejected.

Sd/-

(K. Radhashyam Singh)

State Chief Information Commissioner

Manipur Information Commission

Appeal Case No. 70 of 2023

Moirangthem Mani Singh – Appellant.
-Vs-
The SPIO/ SDC, (HQ), Thoubal, Manipur & Anr. – Respondents.

DECISION
Dated: - 25.1.2024

The SPIO/ DSLR & AS & SO, Thoubal is represented by Shri G. Bisharup Sharma, AS & SO, DSLR. The School Governing Council of the New Public Higher Secondary School, Khangabok, Thoubal District is represented by Shri K. Jayanta Sharma, G.B member. The SDC (HQ) DC, Thoubal is present. The Appellant is present.

During the hearing the Public Authority of the DSLR placed the pertinent Dag Chitha & Jamabandi Books before the Commission. On checking the said land records in question, it is confirmed that out of 2.48 acres, 1.16 acres is entered in the name of the said School and 1.28 acres is in the name of Shri Moirangthem Mani Singh who is the present Appellant. However, the remaining .04 acres is missing. Shri K. Jayanta Sharma, G.B member of the said School submitted that some portion of the said land was donated by the Appellant for setting up a private School some years back. There was an agreement between the G.B members of the said School and the doner. However, the same was gutted by a fire incident, he added.

On being asked to the Appellant for giving his opinion in connection with the statement of the G.B member of the said School, he admitted that there was an agreement between the two parties and he did not object with the land belonging to the school measuring an area of 1.16 acres. He further reiterated that the remaining portion of the said land measuring an area of 1.28 acres as of now should be in his possession. As such, he requested the Public Authorities to furnish the certified Patta/Dag Chitha measuring an area of 1.28 acres of the said land positively as recorded in the Records of Rights and prayed the Commission to close the Appeal.

The concerned Public Authority assured to furnish the said Patta to the Appellant by today itself.

Upon hearing from the parties, the Commission reprimanded the Appellant for misusing the RTI Act by concealing facts and information about the donation/ agreement made between the two parties, and misinforming that the said land in question is not entered in the record of rights.

As such there is no need for further proceedings as the Appellant is satisfied with the information furnished by the Public Authority.

Accordingly, the present Appeal case is closed.

Sd/-
(K. Radhashyam Singh)
State Chief Information Commissioner,
Manipur Information Commission

Appeal Case No. 87 of 2023

Lairenlakpam Diko – Appellant.

-Vs-

The SPIO/ Deputy Director, Social Welfare, Manipur & Anr. – Respondents.

DECISION

Dated: - 8.2.2024

The FAA Social Welfare is absent. Smt. Sandhyarani Devi, ASPIO (SW), Robindro Salam DCPO/ Churachandpur & Pherzawl, Mr. Chengpai P. Accountant/ Senapati & Kangpokpi, Ms. Indrani Chongtham, DCPO/ Imphal East & Jiribam, Konjengbam Anita, DCPO/ Thoubal/ Kakching, DCPO/ Chandel & Tengnoupal, Smt. Y. Sanatombi Devi, DCPO/ Imphal West, Mr. Babuna Dangmei, DCPO/ Tamenglong & Noney, S. Chandrakala Devi, Accountant/ DCPO Bishnupur, Pabitra Thingbaijam, DCPO/ Ukhrul & Kamjong are present. The Appellant is present.

During hearing the Appellant submitted that he has received all the sought information from the concerned Pubic Authorities. However, he asked the Public Authorities to clarify on some parts of the query Nos. (iii) & (iv) regarding statement of sanction orders and joint signature of the cash book.

The ASPIO (SW) clarified that in case of the statement of sanction orders as asked by the Appellant in query No. (iii) of the RTI Application, all the annexures already provided to the Appellant is/ are self-explanatory. The remaining Public Authorities further submitted that in case of joint signature in the Cash Book, there is no rigid rule to append joint signature by the concerned authorities.

The Appellant being duly clarified of all the information he received expressed his satisfaction and prayed for closing the present Appeal case.

Upon hearing from the parties, the Commission is of the opinion that as the Appellant is fully convinced and satisfied with information received and, there is no further need for intervention in the proceedings of the present case. Hence, the Appeal case is closed.

Sd/-

(K. Radhashyam Singh)

State Chief Information Commissioner,

Manipur Information Commission.

Appeal Case No. 92 of 2023

Lian Thangvung –Appellant.
-Vs-
The SPIO/ SDC (HQ), Churachandpur, Manipur & Anr.
– Respondents.

DECISION
Dated: - 01.03.2024

The FAA/ SPIO, DC Churachandpur is represented by Shri Solomon Fimate, SDO, Tuibong, through audio conference. The Appellant is also present through video conference.

The Appellant submitted that he has received the information yesterday, however he wanted clarification from the Public Authority about the cadastral map.

The Public Authority clarified that the cadastral map was based on the revenue survey held in the year 1961. He further reiterated that as per the Manipur State Hill Peoples' Administration Regulation Act, 1947, Leishang Village is listed under Sardar Circle No. 3, Sl. No. 171. There is no record of Leishang village on the map and the boundary of the village, size, area & revenue map, etc., he added. He further stated that all the information as available in the office had already been provided to the Appellant.

Upon hearing from both the parties the Commission is of the view that under the provision of the RTI Act, the information shall be provided to the Appellant as available with the Public Authority. Accordingly, there is no need for further intervention with the sought information.

Hence, the present Appeal case is closed.

Sd/-
(K. Radhashyam Singh)
State Chief Information Commissioner,
Manipur Information Commission.

Complaint Case No. 13 of 2024

Laishram Birendra Singh – Appellant.

-Vs-

The SPIO/ SDC, Imphal West (S), Mayang Imphal, Manipur & Anr – Respondents.

DECISION

Dated: - 14.3.2024

Ningombam Rabichandra Meitei, SDC, Mayang Imphal appears in person. The Complainant is also present.

During the hearing the SDC, Mayang Imphal submitted reply of the Show Cause notice to the Commission. He further submitted that the Complainant had not filed the RTI application through proper channel. He also stated that as the Complainant did not file his RTI application through proper channel the same application has not reached his office in time. But the said application reached his office after the lapse of mandatory time, he added. He also submitted that he is ever ready to furnish the information sought by the Complainant.

On checking the whole body of the case records, the Commission confirms that there is some procedural error or mistake at the initial stage of filing RTI application. The Commission also explains the said procedural error or mistake to the Complainant. Thereafter, the Complainant realize his mistake and the procedural lapses on his part. He prayed the Commission not to proceed the present Complaint case and seek liberty to file a fresh RTI application through appropriate authority as per the provision of the RTI Act.

As the procedural error has been admitted by the Complainant, the Commission is of the view that there is no need for further intervention in the present case. However, the Complainant is given a liberty to file a fresh RTI application to the concern Public Authority as per the provision of the Act.

The Commission also observes that there is no malafide intention of the Public Authority for the delay in furnishing the sought information. Accordingly, the penal action against him is dropped.

The present Complaint case is closed, henceforth.

Sd/-

(K. Radhashyam Singh)

State Chief Information Commissioner

Manipur Information Commission

No. 2/1(5)/2008-FB(RTI)
GOVERNMENT OF MANIPUR
SECRETARIAT: FINANCE DEPARTMENT
(Budget Section)

OFFICE MEMORANDUM
Imphal, the 4th February, 2009

Subject: - *Head of Account for Deposit of fees collected from the public requesting for information under RTI Act, 2005.*

Fees collected from the public requesting for information under RTI Act, 2005 is to be deposited under the receipt Head indicated below: -

Major Head 0070-Other Administrative Services

Sub-Major 01- Administration of Justice

Major 501- Services & Service Fees

For the fees collected in the form of Demand Draft or Banker Cheque the Department may utilize the Bank Account which has already been opened for salary transaction by the Department/Drawing and Disbursing Officer.

2. This Office Memorandum will take immediate effect.

Sd/-.
(A.N. Jha)
Principal Secretary (Finance),
Government of Manipur

Memo No. 2/1/(5)/2008-FB(RTI): Imphal, the 4th February, 2009.

GOVERNMENT OF MANIPUR
DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL & ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS
(ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS DIVISION)

—

NOTIFICATION

Imphal, the 28th May, 2011

No. 11/4/2005 – AR: In supersession of all earlier Notifications issued in this regard and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 24 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (22 of 2005), the Governor of Manipur is pleased to notify the exemption of the **following organizations of the State Government** from the purview of the Right to Information Act, 2005:

(1) The Manipur Police Department comprising of: -
   (i) Civil Police,
   (ii) Manipur Police Wireless,
   (iii) Manipur Rifles,
   (iv) India Reserve Battalions,
   (v) Intelligence Wings (Special Branch & Crime Branch of CID),
   (vi) Forensic Science Laboratory.

(2) Jail Department,

(3) State Vigilance Commission and its subordinate offices, and

(4) Home Department (*in regard to reports of Enquiry Commissions, Magisterial Enquiries & classified reports including those of MHA & IB).*

2. Exemption of the above organizations, however, shall be subject to the provisos under sub-section 4 of section 24 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 relating to information sought for pertaining to allegations of corruption and human rights violation.

Sd/-
(Kh. Raghumani Singh)
Additional Secretary (AR), Govt. of Manipur.