

Pakistan Information Commission

Government of Pakistan

Order

Appeal No 4020-10/24

Asif Ali Raza

Vs

Sheikh Zaid Hospital, Lahore

July 15, 2025

Tahir Yaseen, Law Officer, Sheikh Zaid Hospital, Lahore appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. The public body, vide letter dated 27-01-2025, furnished written reply dated 05-03-2025 along with certified copies of the required documents, and the same was shared with the appellant, who acknowledged its receipt but raised certain objections vide his rejoinder dated 10-05-2025. Reply to the same has been furnished by the public body.
2. The Commission has examined the information request, written reply of the public body, documents furnished along with the reply, rejoinder of the appellant, and the reply of the public body. It is noted that all documents required by the appellant have been furnished by the public body in the shape of certified copies, and the same have been received by the appellant.
3. The grievances shown by the appellant in his rejoinder do not fall within the domain of this Commission. For the same, he may approach the relevant forum.
4. 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 4339-12/24

Dr. G.M.Chaudhry

Vs

Islamabad Healthcare Regulatory Authority

July 15, 2025

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

1. The appellant vide his information request dated 11-12-2024 sent to the Chairman, IHRA has requested following information,
 - (a) Names, educational qualifications in the above fields as mentioned in paragraphs 1(i) of the Advertisement for the Post of CEO, IHRA, designations and departments/organizations of the applicants with their contact/cell numbers interviewed for the post.
 - (b) Names and educational qualifications with additional higher qualifications in law, management and/or clinical/medical subjects, designations and departments/organizations of the applicants with their contact/cell numbers who are falling in PREFERENCE mentioned in paragraph 1(ii) of the Advertisement for the Post of CEO, IHRA.
 - (c) Names of the candidates as mentioned in paragraphs 1(i) of the Advertisement, designations and departments/organizations of the applicants with their contact/cell numbers who are falling in PREFERENCE mentioned in paragraph 1(iii) of the Advertisement for the Post of CEO, IHRA.
 - (d) Names of the candidates as mentioned in paragraphs 1(i) of the Advertisement, designations and departments/organizations of the applicants with their contact/cell numbers who are falling in PREFERENCE mentioned in paragraph 1(iv) of the Advertisement for the Post of CEO, IHRA.
2. Allegedly, he was not provided the required information within the stipulated time period, hence he filed this appeal. Upon institution of the appeal, notice was issued to the public body, who has filed written reply dated Nil. The same was shared with the appellant vide letter dated 20-05-2025 under RGL No. 153052094.
3. The public body in its written response has contested that the required information is exempted from disclosure under Sections 7(g) and 7(h), and

Sections 16(c) and 16(g) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017. The appellant has not filed any written objection over the response of the public body, but today during his arguments before the Commission, he has contested the plea of the public body.

4. The Commission has examined the contents of the information request, memo of appeal, written response of the public body, and also heard the arguments of the appellant, and found that the record/information submitted by the candidates who applied for a specific post in the public body is not public record.
5. Section 7 of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017 excludes certain records and provides that nothing contained in Section 6 shall apply to the records mentioned in clauses (a) to (h) of the said provision. Under Sections 7(g) and 7(h) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017, *it is provided that records relating to the personal privacy of any individual and records of private documents furnished to a public body either on an express or implied condition that the information contained in any such document shall not be disclosed to a third party are exempted from disclosure.*
6. In view of the above, the record required by the appellant pertains to the personal privacy of the individuals and cannot be disclosed to any other person without their consent, as provided in the law referred above. Therefore, the objections raised by the appellant during his arguments are turned down. 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 4432-01/2025

Nadeem Tanoli

Vs

Pakistan Medical and Dental Council (PM&DC)

July 15, 2025

Sundas Kanwal, Assistant, PMDC appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. The public body vide letter dated 30-04-2025 furnished written reply along with copies of the relevant documents and same was shared with the appellant vide letter dated 20-05-2025 under RGL 153052107 but no response has been received from the appellant. It appears that the appellant 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.
2. 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 4614-03/2025

Muhammad Arif

Vs

State Bank of Pakistan (SBP)

July 15, 2025

Gulfam Advocate appeared on behalf of the appellant.

Mehmood Nazir Rana, Law Officer, SBP appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. The appellant vide his information request dated 25-03-2025 required the following information,
 - i. A copy of the records corresponding to Code: 293182 and Title: Haris Flour Mills.
 - ii. Whether the Mills according to the credentials mentioned in Para-02 of this instant application is appear on the default list as loan/credit defaulter of the State Bank of Pakistan.
 - iii. If the Mills are on the default list, which commercial bank or other institution reported them to the State Bank of Pakistan, &
 - iv. The amount of loan reported against the Mills.
 - v. All documentary evidence obtained by the State Bank of Pakistan from the loan-reporting institution concerning the Mills.
 - vi. The identity credentials of any other mill, artificial person, or legal entity reported to the State Bank of Pakistan as a loan defaulter under the name "Haris Flour Mills."
2. It is the stance of the appellant that he never obtained loan from any bank, but when he applied for a loan on behalf of Floor Mill, it was declined. The reason verbally communicated by the Manager to the appellant is that the appellant is already on the default list of the SBP under code 293182 titled *Haris Floor Mills*. The amount of the default has been quoted to be Rs. 3,474,682/-.
3. Since the required information was not provided to the appellant within the stipulated time period, he approached this Commission by filing this appeal.

4. Upon notice of the Commission, SBP vide letter dated 21-04-2025 has furnished written reply.
5. In Para 3 of the written reply of the public body, it is mentioned that the factual position in the matter has already been communicated to the appellant on 17-04-2025 by the concerned bank, HBL, the contents of which are self-explanatory. The email was furnished along with the written reply as Flag A. The Commission has examined the content of the said email, which is addressed to the appellant.
6. It is mentioned in the said email that: "With reference to your complaint received from SBP regarding ECIB reporting, we would like to inform you that, as per bank's record, we are not reporting Haris Flour and General Mills located in Tehsil Pindi Gheb, District Attock in SBP's ECIB report. Furthermore, it is to reaffirm that borrower code 293182 doesn't pertain to your company."
7. Para 3 of the written reply, read with email Flag A, makes it clear that the appellant's flour mill is not shown to be a defaulter on the list of ECIB (Electronic Credit Information Bureau). When the concerned bank has categorically informed the appellant that he is not shown to be a defaulter on the ECIB, no question arises regarding obtaining the required information from SBP in respect of the alleged loan.
8. Therefore, 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 4682-04/2025

Ishaque Ahmed Khawaja

Vs

President Office

July 15, 2025

None appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. Information furnished by the public body was shared with the appellant vide letter dated 23-06-2025 under RGL No. 153082515. No objection has been received from the appellant. It appears that the appellant is satisfied with the response of the public body. The appeal stands disposed of. Copy of the order be sent to both the parties.
2. 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 4695-05/2025

Ashba Kamran

Vs

Cabinet Division

July 15, 2025

Qutbudeen, Deputy Secretary, Cabinet Division appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. The representative of the public body has furnished categorical reply to the queries of the appellant which meets with the requirement of the information request. Copy of the written reply be shared with the appellant. No need to wait or proceed further.

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 4694-05/2025

Parvez Akhtar

Vs

Cantonment Board Gujranwala

July 15, 2025

Muhammad Sajid, Assistant PRO, Cantonment Board Gujranwala appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. The appellant, vide his information request addressed to the CEO, Cantonment Board Gujranwala, required issuance of certified death certificate of Asif Javed Tarrar (deceased), real brother of the appellant. However, the public body failed to issue the said certificate within the stipulated time; hence, he filed this appeal before the Commission.
2. Upon receiving notice of the Commission after institution of this appeal, the public body, vide letter dated 15-05-2025, filed a written reply and submitted that if copy of the CNIC of the appellant, application on the prescribed form, FRC proving relation with the deceased, and payment of the fee is received, the certificate shall be issued. It was further added that an original death certificate of the deceased, Asif Javed Tarrar, was issued on the request of Ms. Sidra Sikandar, daughter of the deceased, and no request for issuance of duplicate death certificate was received from her or her family members up till now.
3. Copy of the written reply was shared with the appellant, who acknowledged its receipt, and vide his rejoinder dated 19-06-2025, stated his relation to the deceased through alternate documents, which have been attached with his reply. In Para 6 of the rejoinder, the appellant submitted that as the brother of the deceased, he qualifies to obtain the death certificate under the Local Government Birth, Death and Marriage Regulations Rules, 2023.
4. Reply to the rejoinder has been submitted by the public body. It is submitted that under Section 2(c) of the *ibid* rules, the appellant does not qualify as an affected person. It is further added that the name of the mother of the deceased is Sakina Bibi; however, the appellant failed to provide the name of his mother, as the father of the deceased adopted the appellant, as is evident from the reference to Section 2(c) *ibid*.
5. The Commission has examined the information request, written reply, rejoinder of the appellant, and the reply thereto. The appellant claims himself to be the brother of the deceased, Asif Javed Tarrar, and claims that he qualifies to obtain the death certificate under Section 2(c).

6. As per the claim of the public body, by virtue of Section 2(c) as mentioned above, the appellant is not the real brother of the deceased and is, in fact, an adopted brother of the deceased. Therefore, he is not entitled to obtain the death certificate.
7. This Commission is of the view that the appellant should establish his relation with the deceased as his real brother through a competent civil court and then obtain the death certificate from the concerned quarter, if so allowed.
8. 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

