

**Pakistan Information Commission**

**Government of Pakistan**

**Order**

**Appeal No. 5098-11/2025**

**Azhar Hussain**

**Vs**

**President Office**

December 23, 2025

None present on behalf of the public body despite issuance of two notices to the Deputy Director (Legal) / Designated Officer of the President Secretariat, Aiwan-e-Saddar. As the Commission was considering proceeding further into the matter, it had another look at the information request and observed that the questions raised in the information request do not pertain directly to the President House. As a matter of fact, the queries relate to implementation, monitoring, and enforcement of maternity leaves, for which the appropriate forum is the Ministry of Law and Justice. The appeal stands disposed of. The applicant is advised to approach the Ministry of Law and Justice for seeking the required information, and in case of no response, he may file a new appeal before the Commission under the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017. 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. 4884-08/2025**

**Aftab Ahmed**

**Vs**

**Pakistan Mineral Development Corporation**

December 23, 2025

Applicant present in person. Usman Ahmed Khan, Manager (HR), PMDC appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. Show cause notice was issued to the General Manager, PMDC on 03-11-2025. The reply has been submitted on 22-12-2025, citing reasons for delay in compliance and also showing utmost respect for the directions and orders passed by this Commission. The General Manager, PMDC has requested to recall the show cause notice, stating that the delay was neither intentional nor deliberate. In view of the reply to the show cause notice, which is found satisfactory, it is hereby withdrawn.
2. The public body, vide letter dated 22-12-2025, has filed a revised reply to the question asked by the applicant, which was read over to him. This reply meets the questions asked by the applicant, as he had sought certain information about an assistant. The applicant wants to know the status of his initial appointment, for which he is advised to file a fresh and specific information request under Section 11 of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017. The applicant understands. The implementation proceedings stand settled. 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. 4995-10/2025**

**Humayun Iqbal Shami**

**Vs**

**Wafaqi Mohtasib (Ombudsman's) Secretariat**

December 23, 2025

Syed Iftikhar Hussain Naqvi, Associate Advisor / PIO, Wafaqi Mohtasib (Ombudsman's), Secretariat appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. The public body in response to the information request has filed written reply which was shared with the applicant who has filed rejoinder.
2. Taking advantage of the presence of the applicant, who is a senior advocate of the High Court, and the representative of the public body, the matter was discussed in the light of the Presidential Directives to the Wafaqi Mohtasib, the information request, and the response of the public body.
3. After lengthy discussion, it was crystallized that the order was passed by the Wafaqi Mohtasib on the directions of the President of Pakistan.
4. The applicant has submitted that there should be a definition of "reasonable time" and that somebody should be responsible for the delay, as the President has passed directions to the Federal Ombudsman to decide the matter within a reasonable time.
5. The representative of the public body has submitted that President's Order No. 1 of 1983, read with the Federal Ombudsmen Institutional Reforms Act, 2013, does not mention the duration of the phrase "reasonable time." This duration is not mentioned in President's Order No. 1 of 1983, read with the Wafaqi Mohtasib Institution Reforms Act, 2013.
6. The learned advocate (applicant) states that the duration mentioned for disposal of compliance by the Wafaqi Mohtasib is 60 days, whereas the representative of the public body states that the period of 60 days is for fresh complaint and that the case in hand was not based on a fresh complaint. It also transpired that the order is signed by the Wafaqi Mohtasib, who bears all the responsibility for the timeline, authenticity, and compliance of the orders.

7. In view of the position outlined above, basic information has been provided to the applicant, and there is not much that can be extracted from the public body. The learned advocate (applicant) may like to take up the matter at the proper forum, if he so deems fit. 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

