

**OFFICE OF THE
ASSAM INFORMATION COMMISSION
JONAKEE COMPLEX, PANJABARI, GUWAHATI-781 037**

Case No. : JRT.30/2017
Complainant : Shri Raktim Ranjan Saikia
Respondent : Veterinary Officer, kakajan Vety Hospital.
Date of hearing : 1.9.2017
Complaint/ Second : Smti. N.A. Hazarika, IAS (Retd)
Appeal heard by : State Information Commissioner, Assam

O R D E R

1.9.2017

Today's hearing is a follow up action of order dated 22.2.17 in case No. SIC/JRT.7/2017 wherein the Commission remanded the matter to the first appellate authority for hearing and disposal of the matter through speaking order.

The Block Vety. Officer (BVO) has submitted a written statement on 25.8.17 stating that he had informed the Commission vide letter dated 18.2.17 that the information sought for by the petitioner was furnished to him. He mentioned that he had already informed the petitioner that he did not have any financial power and as such he was not in a position to furnish any detail of expenditure of implementation of fodder cultivation. He has mentioned that minutes of the meeting, after hearing by the first appellate authority (as directed) has been communicated to the Commission vide letter dated 22.2.17, copy of the same is not available on records. It is seen that a complaint petition was filed by the petitioner has been put up by the Diarist in a separate file registered as JRT.30/17. The said file be closed and correspondences in this regard be transferred to file No. JRT.7/17. The Diarist is cautioned to be careful in future.

On perusal of records it is seen that the complainant vide letter dated 2.5.17 alleged that the information furnished by the BVO Dr. P.K. Neog was false. He also stated that the District A.H & Vety. Officer Dr. H.N. Saikia heard both the parties as a first appellate authority, as directed by the Commission and furnished three pages' reply to the petitioner. He mentioned that the information furnished by the first appellate authority stated that Dr. Neog was a member of the Implementation Committee, which was denied by Dr. Neog in his reply also. He also alleged that the first appellate authority favouring Dr. Neog did not furnish complete information as such he filed the complaint against Dr. P.K. Neog and Dr. H.N. Saikia. He prayed that action should be taken against Dr. Neog for furnishing false information and against Dr. H.N. Saikia, first appellate authority for favouring Dr. Neog. He did not furnish information relating to fund received under irrigation.

The petitioner has made a written submission on 30.8.17 that he will not be able to attend today's hearing i.e. on 1.9.17 due to his illness. In the aforesaid petition he has repeated the allegations already noted in his complaint petition dated 2.5.17.

After careful examination of available records the Commission observes that the information sought for by the petitioner have been furnished by the BVO, Dr. P.K. Neog and the District A.H. & Vety. Officer, Shri H.N. Saikia. The BVO in his written statement dated 25.8.17 mentioned that he did not have any drawing and disbursing power, as such question of implementation of scheme by incurring expenditure does

not arise. He also mentioned that allegation made by the petitioner that he was a member of the implementation committee is absolutely false. The Committee referred to by the petitioner of which he is a member was a Tender Committee and not an implementing Committee. The allegation is baseless as well as the allegation that the District A.H. & Vety. Officer favoured the BVO was false. The petitioner alleged that he was not furnished information on expenditure of fund for irrigation. The BVO stated that since irrigation schemes were not implemented, question of expenditure of the said scheme does not arise. He has also mentioned that work relating to fencing, trance cutting, irrigation, etc. were supervised by the District A.H. & Vety Officer and executed by the Junior Engineer or the Asstt. Engineer. The BVO Stated that the allegations made by the petitioner was absolutely false and his comment that the BVO took the RTI Act lightly and used derogatory term as buffoonery against the Government official on duty is offensive and has requested the Commission to warn the petitioner not to use such un-parliamentary words in future. He reiterated that the allegation made by the petitioner that he furnished false information was absolutely false and without any basis.

After careful examination of available records, the Commission observes that the informations sought for by the petitioner have been furnished by the BVO and District A.H. & Vety Officer. The Commission observes that use of such derogatory language by the petitioner against the Govt. official on duty is also offensive and the petitioner is cautioned not to use such un-parliamentary words in future.

In view of the facts and circumstances stated above, the complaint petition dated 20.1.17 is found to be without any merit and hence dismissed.

(N.A. Hazarika)
State Information Commissioner, Assam
Panjabari, Guwahati

Authenticated true copy.

Registrar i/c
Assam Information Commission

Memo No. SIC/ JRT.30/2017/

Dtd. 1.9.2016

Copy to:

1. The District A.H. & Vety, Officer, Jorhat Dist., Jorhat, Assam for information.
2. The Block Vety. Officer, Kakojan, Jorhat, Assam for information.
3. Shri Raktim Ranjan Saikia, Vill- Naoboisha Gaon, PO- Desoinagar, Jorhat, Assam, PIN- 785015
4. Computer Section for uploading in the Website.
5. Office File.
6. Order Book.

Registrar i/c
Assam Information Commission