

Pakistan Information Commission
Government of Pakistan
(Camp Office, Karachi)

Order

Appeal No. 5005-10/2025

Dr. Tauseef Ahmed Khan

Vs

Federal Urdu University of Arts, Science & Technology

February 16, 2026 None appeared on behalf of the public body. However, the public body vide letter dated 1-12-2025 furnished written reply of all the three queries of the applicant, which was shared with the applicant by notice dated 06-01-2026 under RGL No. 154224412. A period of more than 20 days as required under the Access to Information Regulations 2023 have passed. No objection has been received from the applicant. It appears that the applicant is satisfied with the response of the public body. 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
(Camp Office, Karachi)

Order

Appeal No. 4769-06/2025

Dr. Tauseef Ahmed Khan

Vs

Federal Urdu University of Arts, Science & Technology

February 16, 2026 None appeared on behalf of the public body. However, the public body vide letter dated 01-12-2025 furnished written reply of all the three queries of the applicant, which was shared with the applicant by notice dated 06-01-2026 under RGL No.154224491. A period of more than 20 days as required under the Access to Information Regulations 2023 have passed. No objection has been received from the applicant. It appears that the applicant is satisfied with the response of the public body. 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
(Camp Office, Karachi)

Order

Appeal No. 4836-07/2025

Zubair Ahmed Jamali

Vs

Pakistan Railways

February 16, 2026 Sheema Ghani, Divisional Personnel Officer, Pakistan Railways appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. The public body vide letter dated 03-12-2025 and 29-11-2025 furnished the required information which was shared with the applicant vide notice dated 06-01-2026 under RGL Number 154224413. A period of more than 20 days as required under the Access to Information Regulations 2023 have passed. No objection has been received from the applicant. It appears that the applicant is satisfied with the response of the public body. 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

(Camp Office, Karachi)

Order

Appeal No. 4998-10/2025

Amir Baloch

Vs

College of Physicians and Surgeons Pakistan (CPSP)

February 16, 2026 Applicant present in person. Muhammad Salim Khan, Senior Law Officer and Samina Hassan, PIO, CPSP appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. The public body vide letter dated 13-02-2026 has filed a written reply taking the plea that it does not fall within the definition of a public body. Moreover, exemption under section 7 (g) and 16 (c) of the RTI Act 2017 is also claimed in respect of the required information.
2. Before proceeding further, let copy of the reply be shared with the applicant for filing rejoinder, if any.
3. Office will communicate the next date of hearing in due course of time.

Ijaz Hassan Awan
Information Commissioner

Shoaib Ahmad Siddiqui
Chief Information Commissioner

Pakistan Information Commission
Government of Pakistan
(Camp Office, Karachi)

Order

Appeal No. 5040-10/2025

Amir Baloch

Vs

College of Physicians and Surgeons Pakistan (CPSP)

February 16, 2026

Applicant present in person. Muhammad Salim Khan, Senior Law Officer and Samina Hassan, PIO, CPSP appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. Aamir Baloch, applicant, vide his information request dated 06-10-2025 addressed to the Regional Director Hyderabad, College of Physicians and Surgeons Pakistan, required the following information in respect of Miss Fozia Rajpar, daughter of Abdul Karim Rajpar, a lady working in the office of the Respondent;

“1. True and certified copies of the record showing the service/employment status of the above-named person in CPSP Hyderabad Region.

2. Certified copy of the appointment order issued in favour of the said person.

3. Certified copy of the employment contract/engagement agreement executed between CPSP and the said person.

4. Certified copies of the last salary slips of the said person for the period from February 2012 to February 2013.

5. Certified copies of the record relating to all perks, allowances, and privileges disbursed to the said person by your department.

2. Allegedly, the said information was not provided to the applicant within the time prescribed under the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017. Hence, he filed this appeal before the Commission.

3. The Commission, after institution of the appeal, issued notice to the Respondent, and the Respondent, vide letter dated 14-11-2025, furnished a written reply stating that the information relating to Miss Fozia, who has already left the job, is confidential as per section 7(g) and 16(c) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017, which cannot be provided, and requested review of the direction.

4. The Commission shared a copy of the written reply with the applicant, who filed a rejoinder on 16-12-2025 and contested the plea of the public body, stating that the information required by the applicant is not exempted from disclosure under any provision of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017.

5. The public body, in response to the rejoinder of the applicant, vide letter dated 02-01-2026, filed a written reply. In the written reply to

the rejoinder, it is stated that at present, Ms. Fozia Rajpar is not in the employment of the College of Physicians and Surgeons as stated by the applicant. It is further added that the information demanded in para 2 of the application under sections 7 and 16 of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017 is exempted from disclosure.

6. In addition to that, in paragraph number 3 of the written reply to the rejoinder, the Respondent has stated that it is not a public body as it does not fall under the purview of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017, which they have already informed to PIC Islamabad in a large number of matters and replied accordingly, and that it does not figure anywhere in the list of departments and Public Information Officers issued by PIC Islamabad.

7. The applicant has also contested the said plea of the public body vide his second rejoinder dated 11-11-2026.

8. The Commission has gone through the contents of the information request, memo of appeal, written reply furnished by the public body on 14-11-2025, and subsequent replies of the rejoinders and plea of the Respondent taken in all the replies.

9. First of all, the Commission intends to resolve the controversy and decide the plea of the Respondent that it does not fall under the definition of public body.

10. Under section 2(ix)(b) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017, defines public body as under:

“Any Federal and Municipal or Local Authority set up, established by or under any Federal Law.”

Similarly, under section 2(ix)(g) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017, it is stated that

“any other organization which undertakes a public function to the extent of that function.”

Under section 2(ix)(h), it is provided that a non-governmental organization which directly or indirectly receives or has received public funds, subsidy, tax exemption, piece of land, or any other benefit involving public funds, and any other non-governmental organization or body registered under any law for the time being in force.

11. In response to section 2(ix)(h), the representative of the public body has submitted that they are neither receiving any public funds, subsidy, or tax exemption from the Federal Government, nor is the land under the use of their office owned by the Federal Government. It was stated that the Respondent has purchased the piece of land which is in its possession.

12. However, no documentary proof was submitted at this stage. Even otherwise, if it is considered that the Respondent does not fall under the category of section 2(ix)(h), even then admittedly Pakistan College of Physicians and Surgeons was established under a Federal

Act/Ordinance, i.e., Pakistan College of Physicians and Surgeons Ordinance, 1962. It also undertakes a public function as provided under section 2(ix)(g) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017.

13. As far as the space of this body is concerned, in other than Karachi cities, they occupy government buildings. So, clause 2(ix)(h) is attracted in this case.

As far as public functions are concerned, the preamble of the Ordinance which established the CPSP clearly states that “whereas it is expedient to establish a College of Physicians and Surgeons in Pakistan for maintaining high principles of medical professions, promoting specialist medical practice, arranging post-graduate medical training and for matters related thereto.” The medical profession is very important for the people.

14. Moreover, section 5 of the Ordinance says that the College will promote specialist practice of medicine in various fields, arrange post-graduate medical, surgical and other specialist training, hold and conduct examinations for grant of diplomas and admission to the fellowship of the council, and also coordinate the medical professionals in the country.

15. As far as the first President of the Council is concerned, he was to be nominated by the Federal Government, and the first Council also had membership from the Central Government and the Government of the Provinces. Thereafter, office bearers will be elected.

16. Section 17 of the Ordinance says that the President and other members of the Council and every other officer and servant of the College acting or purporting to act under this Ordinance shall be deemed to be public servant within the meaning of section 21 of the Pakistan Penal Code.

17. Seeing all this, it is amply clear that the Ordinance has significant linkage with the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017, in particular section 2(ix), which brings the College of Physicians and Surgeons within the definition of a public body.

18. Therefore, the Commission concludes that the Respondent is a public body as defined under section 2(ix)(b), (g), and (h) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017.

19. As far as the plea of the Respondent regarding exemption claimed under section 7(g) and 16(c) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017 is concerned, it is noted that the information required by the applicant pertains to the service status, appointment letter of an employee along with contract of service, last salary slip, and perks and privileges disbursed to an employee of the Respondent.

20. Under section 5(a) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017, it is provided that the Principal Officer of each public body shall, within six months of the commencement of this Act, ensure that the following categories of information and record are duly published,

including uploading over the internet in a manner which best ensures that these are accessible, subject to reasonable restrictions based on limited resources. In the said provision, perks and privileges of the employees are also included.

21. As far as section 7(g) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017 is concerned, although it is provided that nothing contained in section 6 shall apply to records relating to personal privacy of an individual, the question is whether the information required by the applicant pertains to personal privacy of an individual or otherwise.

22. Under section 16(c) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017, it is provided that information is exempt if its disclosure under this Act would involve invasion of privacy of an individual, including a deceased individual other than the applicant. This exemption shall not apply where the third party is or was an official of a public body and the information relates to his function as a public official.

23. Therefore, the plea of the public body in respect of exemption under section 7(g) and 16(c) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017 is not applicable in this case.

24. In view of the above, the appeal is allowed. Regional Health Director Hyderabad, College of Physicians and Surgeons Pakistan, is directed to furnish the required information within 10 days to this Commission as well as to the applicant. Copy of the order be sent to the President, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Karachi, and the Secretary, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Karachi.

25. Office will communicated the next date of hearing in due course of time.

Ijaz Hassan Awan
Information Commissioner

Shoaib Ahmad Siddiqui
Chief Information Commissioner

Pakistan Information Commission
Government of Pakistan
(Camp Office, Karachi)

Order

Appeal No. 5172-12/2025

M Ishfaq Khan

Vs

Defence Housing Authority Karachi (DHA)

February 16, 2026

None appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. Information furnished by the public body was shared with the applicant vide email dated 07-01-2026. A period of more than 20 days as required under the Access to Information Regulations 2023 have passed. No objection has been received from the applicant. It appears that the applicant is satisfied with the response of the public body. 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
(Camp Office, Karachi)

Order

Appeal No. 5162-11/2025

Zahid Islam Khan

Vs

Hyderabad Electric Supply Company (HESCO)

February 16, 2026

None appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. Information furnished by the public body was shared with the applicant who vide his letter dated 10-02-2026 have acknowledged its receipt and expressed satisfaction over the information provided by the public body.

2. In view of above, 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

