

Pakistan Information Commission

Government of Pakistan

Order

Appeal No 4513-02/2025

Farrukh Nawaz Bhatti

Vs

Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan (SECP)

May 20, 2025

Boo Ali Khan, Management Executive, SECP appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. The representative of the public body has submitted copy of the letter dated 27-02-2025 addressed to the appellant in response to his information request, stating that the specific name of the company has not been mentioned by the appellant in his information request so that the public body may respond to it accordingly. It is further added that the appellant, instead of removing the objection, has approached the Commission.
2. Under Section 11(iii) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017, it is provided that a citizen of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan may make a request to the public body through the designated officer, and the written request made by him should identify the information or record sought in sufficient detail to enable the public body to locate it, and should include the complete address and contact details of the appellant for delivery of the information.
3. In the present case, the appellant has not identified the information in sufficient detail to enable the public body to locate it and has directly approached the Commission without letting the public body know the details of the public body. Therefore, the appeal is not maintainable under Section 11(iii) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017. The appellant, at the first instance, should specify the name of the company about which the information is required from the public body, and if it is not provided, then he may file the appeal.
4. The appeal stands disposed of. Copy of the order be sent to both the parties.

Ijaz Hassan Awan
Information Commissioner

Shoaib Ahmad Siddiqui
Chief Information Commissioner

Pakistan Information Commission

Government of Pakistan

Order

Appeal No 4233-11/2024

Amir Baloch

Vs

Federal Board of Revenue (FBR)

May 20, 2025

Syed Shabih Haider, Deputy Director and Zafar Iqbal, Second Secretary, FBR appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. In compliance with the order of the Commission dated 08-05-2025, the public body has furnished certified copy of the order of the IHC dated 06-05-2025 vide which operation of the order dated 09-04-2025 and 28-04-2025 has been suspended.
2. In view of above, the appeal is sine-die adjourned. However, if fat of the appeal is decided in favor of the appelland, he may approach this Commission for implementation of the above mentioned orders. Copy of the order be sent to both the parties.

Ijaz Hassan Awan
Information Commissioner

Shoaib Ahmad Siddiqui
Chief Information Commissioner

Pakistan Information Commission

Government of Pakistan

Order

Appeal No 4535-02/2025

Amir Baloch

Vs

Higher Education Commission (HEC)

May 20, 2025

None appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. The public body vide letter dated 16-04-2025 furnished the required information. Information furnished by the public body was shared with the appellant vide letter dated 21-04-2025 under RGL No. 153080851. No objection has been received from the appellant. It appears that the appellant is satisfied with the response of the public body. The Commission has also examined the information request and the response of the public body and found that it meets the requirements of the information request. No further proceedings are required. The appeal stands disposed of. Copy of the order be sent to both the parties.

Ijaz Hassan Awan
Information Commissioner

Shoaib Ahmad Siddiqui
Chief Information Commissioner

Pakistan Information Commission

Government of Pakistan

Order

Appeal No 4531-02/2025

Sardar Imran Hayat

Vs

Islamabad Electric Supply Company (IESCO)

May 20, 2025

Appellant present in person. None appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. The public body, vide letter dated 14-11-2024, has informed that all the allegations made by the appellant in his information request are false, as Mr. Sardar Ali, Line Man, is not involved in any such activity. Copy of the said written reply was shared with the appellant, who has acknowledged its receipt.
2. Copy of the letter dated 11-12-2024 from the Chief Engineer O&M, IESCO, has also been annexed with the written reply, and copy of the inquiry report is also annexed, in which the allegations of the appellant were found baseless.
3. In view of the categorical reply, coupled with the inquiry report, neither the allegations are found correct nor any record has been found regarding the allegations against Mr. Sardar Ali, Line Man. If the appellant believes the written reply is false, he may file an application under the law against the public body. The appeal stands disposed of. Copy of the order be sent to both the parties.

Ijaz Hassan Awan
Information Commissioner

Shoaib Ahmad Siddiqui
Chief Information Commissioner

Pakistan Information Commission

Government of Pakistan

Order

Appeal No 4151-10/2024

Shahid Khan

Vs

Public Works Department (PWD)

May 20, 2025

Muhammad Nadeem, ADD, Pak-PWD appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. The public body, vide letter dated 21-04-2025, informed that it is ready to share the required information subject to the payment of photocopying charges worth Rs. 6,500/-. Copy of the written reply was shared with the appellant vide letter dated 23-04-2025 under RGL No. 153081162, but no response has been received from the appellant.
2. Therefore, the appeal stands disposed of in the manner that if the appellant deposits the photocopying charges under the Access to Information Regulations, 2023, the public body shall furnish the required information. Copy of the order be sent to both the parties.

Ijaz Hassan Awan
Information Commissioner

Shoaib Ahmad Siddiqui
Chief Information Commissioner

Pakistan Information Commission

Government of Pakistan

Order

Appeal No 4521-02/2025

Ch. Ashraf Ali Gujjar

Vs

Zarai Taraqiati Bank Limited (ZTBL)

May 20, 2025

Junaid Ghouri, SVP / PIO, ZTBL and Mumtaz Ali, Coordinator to PIO, ZTBL appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. The representative of the public body furnished a written reply stating that the information required by the appellant does not fall within the scope of Section 2(v) and 2(x) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017. Moreover, it is submitted that no law can be referred to in respect of the information required by the appellant.
2. According to the information request, the appellant has raised the question of discrimination adopted by the public body in respect of some officers appointed by the public body. During the audit of the public body, it was mentioned that such appointments were illegal, non-transparent, and irregular.
3. After the said audit para, allegedly the public body sacked some of the officers of a similar nature, whereas the others named in the last para of the information request were retained in service. Now the appellant has required from the public body to refer the law under which discrimination was made between the employees mentioned in the information request.
4. The public body has categorically submitted in the written reply that no such law can be referred. Therefore, the information request of the appellant is addressed. The information request of the appellant is addressed. No further proceedings are required. The appeal stands disposed of. Copy of the order be sent to both the parties.

Ijaz Hassan Awan
Information Commissioner

Shoaib Ahmad Siddiqui
Chief Information Commissioner

Pakistan Information Commission

Government of Pakistan

Order

Appeal No 4441-01/2025

Muhammad Ikram Shah

Vs

Ministry of Commerce Employees Cooperative Housing Society (MOCECHS)

May 20, 2025

None appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. This appeal is addressed to the administrators, Ministry of Commerce Employees Cooperative Housing Society, and the President of the said society, whereas the information request is addressed to the President of the society. Any cooperative housing society cannot be treated as a public body in view of the definition of a public body provided under Section 2(ix) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017. Therefore, the appeal is not maintainable and is dismissed. Copy of the order be sent to both the parties.

Ijaz Hassan Awan
Information Commissioner

Shoaib Ahmad Siddiqui
Chief Information Commissioner

Pakistan Information Commission

Government of Pakistan

Order

Appeal No 4057-10/2024

Saman Amjad

Vs

Pakistan Telecommunication Authority (PTA)

May 20, 2025

Iman Hazir Mazari Advocate appeared on behalf of the appellant. Mr. Taimoor Arshad, Director, Azhar Mughal, PS, PTA, Faheem Sohail, Deputy Director and Hamid Maqbool Bhatti, AD, PTA appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. This appeal was originally disposed of vide order dated 28-01-2025. However, the appellant approached the Islamabad High Court through W.P. No. 1168 of 2025, whereupon the Honorable Acting Chief Justice of the Islamabad High Court, vide order dated 25-03-2025, remanded the matter to this Commission with the directions to look into the matter, provide an opportunity to all concerned, peruse the documents which the parties intend to produce, and decide the same only and strictly in accordance with the provisions of the law through a speaking and well-reasoned order within three months from the receipt of the certified copy of this order, under intimation to the Deputy Registrar (Judicial), High Court.
2. In compliance with the order of the Islamabad High Court, the Commission issued notices to the parties, and interim orders dated April 17, 2025, April 29, 2025, May 07, 2025, May 13, 2025, and May 14, 2025 were passed regarding proceedings conducted on those dates.
3. The Commission heard the parties at length and provided ample opportunity to present their point of view and perused the documents submitted by both the parties. The Commission also obtained a fresh reply to the queries of the appellant from the respondent for better understanding of the issue by both the parties. This response was handed over to the learned counsel for the appellant during the hearing dated 14-05-2025.
4. The appellant has sought three points in her information request, which are reproduced below along with the reply of the public body for each query.

Sr.	Information request	Response of the public body
1.	Certified information about the Web Monitoring System (also known as the Web Management System), including details of the country and company from which Pakistan purchased the internet firewall system, as well as the total amount spent on its acquisition.	<p>The Web Monitoring System (WMS) is deployed by PTA Licensees i.e. PTCL. TWA, Cellular Mobile Operators (CMOS) and Long Distance and International (LDI) Operators jointly under their license obligations and Reconciliation of Regulations, 2010. Monitoring and Telephony Traffic</p> <p>The System is procured by the said operators privately. Neither the Government nor the Public Money is involved in its procurement.</p>
2.	Certified information is requested about who will operate the Web Monitoring System, whether it will be managed by the Pakistan Telecommunication Authority (PTA) or the Ministry of Information Technology, and how the system functions.	As mentioned supra, WMS is procured and deployed by the PTA Licensees, therefore, its management is their responsibility so that it continues to function without any issue. Through WMS PTA enforces its mandated actions under Prevention of Electronic Crimes Act, 2016 and Pakistan Telecommunication (re-Organization) Act, 1996.
3.	Certified information is requested about the details of the license for the Web Monitoring System (WMS), including its duration, the holder of the license, renewal requirements, terms and conditions, and associated costs.	There is no telecom license known as WMS.

5. From the perusal of the queries of the information request and the response of the public body as accumulated above, it is clear that objective replies have been provided by the public body.

6. During arguments, the learned counsel for the appellant insisted that the public body, being a regulator, should have complete information vis-à-vis her queries of the information request. She pointed out the role of the public body as a regulator for having such details. The representative of the public body stated that their response is categorical and that under Section 7(h) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017, the said information is excluded from the public record as defined in Section 6 of the

Right of Access to Information Act, 2017. Therefore, the information of third parties (licensees) cannot be disclosed under the Act.

7. The appellant's counsel contested the claim of the public body and even alleged submission of incorrect information and concealment of facts. She stated that she has filed an application dated 02-05-2025 for summoning of record under Section 20(d)(ii) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017. This aspect has been dealt with by the Commission in its order dated 13-05-2025, holding that the record is summoned during inquiry relating to an appeal and not during the proceedings of the appeal, and therefore, the request of the appellant for summoning of record shall be considered during inquiry proceedings. This arrangement was agreed to by the learned counsel for the appellant.
8. In view of what has been discussed above and after judicious examination of the information request, the response of the public body, the arguments advanced from both sides, and the documents available on file, it is clear that the exclusion provided under Section 7(h) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017 is attracted in this appeal. The Commission has to rely on the official written response of the public body submitted with responsibility. The Commission therefore concludes that the available and permissible information has been provided by the public body and there is no room for further intervention. Accordingly, the appeal stands disposed of. Copy of the order be sent to both the parties. Copy of the order be also sent to the Deputy Registrar (Judicial), Islamabad High Court under a covering letter in pursuance of the order dated 25-03-2025 of the Honorable Acting Chief Justice, Islamabad High Court.

Ijaz Hassan Awan
Information Commissioner

Shoaib Ahmad Siddiqui
Chief Information Commissioner