

Pakistan Information Commission
Government of Pakistan
Order

Appeal No: 5022-10/2025

Uzair Razzaq

Vs

Ministry of Commerce

Date:

10-03-2026 Applicant present in person along with his Counsel Ilyas Hussain, Advocate. Ms. Naila Kanwal, Deputy Secretary, Mr. Imran Ali, Section Officer, and Ms. Qurat-ul-Ain Rehman, Legal Advisor, Ministry of Commerce, are present on behalf of the public body.

2. On the last date of hearing, a copy of the written reply filed by the public body on 02-02-2026 was handed over to the learned counsel for the applicant. After perusing the same, the learned counsel submitted that the information cited at serial Nos. 2, 4, 11, 12, 15, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, and 84 had not been furnished, whereas to the remaining extent the applicant was satisfied. The public body was directed to respond to the said objections. In compliance thereof, the public body, vide letter dated 09-03-2026, submitted that the information cited at serial Nos. 2, 4, 12, 15, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 28 does not pertain to the Ministry of Commerce (public body) in terms of Section 12 of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017, and that this fact had already been conveyed to the Commission in the written reply furnished on 17-11-2025.
3. Admittedly, the parent department of Mr. Suhail Ahmed, now in BPS-19, an officer of the Secretariat Group presently posted in the Ministry of Commerce, is the Establishment Division. Therefore, the information sought in respect of the said officer at the above-mentioned serial numbers is maintained by the Establishment Division. Accordingly, the Ministry of Commerce, being the respondent public body in the present appeal, cannot be directed to provide information which is not held by it.
4. As far as the information request at serial No. 11 is concerned, it relates to a certified copy of the noting. The public body submitted that the same cannot be provided under Section 7(a) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017. However, the learned counsel for the public body was confronted with the provision of the said section, which allows disclosure once the matter is finalized. The learned counsel agreed that as

the noting has been finalized, a certified copy of the same shall be provided to the applicant. Accordingly, this controversy stands resolved.

5. The public body further submitted that a copy of the relevant budget had already been provided while submitting the earlier written reply, which is on record of the Commission and has also been shared with the applicant. However, the learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the public body has only provided the budget details for the year 2025, whereas the applicant had requested the budget details for the years during which Mr. Suhail Ahmed, Deputy Secretary, remained posted in AJK Council and the Ministry of Commerce.
6. The Commission has examined the information request at serial No. 68, wherein the applicant has sought copies of the annual departmental budget of the departments where the said officer served while posted earlier and presently. The applicant has not specified any particular year for which the budget details are required. Therefore, as the information request itself is vague and not specified in terms of Section 11 of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017, no further direction can be issued to the public body in this regard. The issue stands decided accordingly.
7. As far as the information requests at serial Nos. 70, 71, 72, 73, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, and 84 are concerned, the public body has taken the plea that the requested information is generic and voluminous, and has further claimed exemption under Sections 7(h) and 16(g)(i) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017. However, when this matter was confronted with the learned counsel for the public body, she agreed that the said information can be provided to the applicant in electronic form through a USB, subject to the condition that the USB device is provided by the applicant. Accordingly, this controversy also stands resolved.
8. In view of the above, the appeal is partially allowed to the extent mentioned above. The public body is directed to furnish the remaining information, either in the form of certified copies or in electronic form through a USB (to be provided by the applicant), within ten (10) days.
9. Adjourned for hearing on 22-04-2026.

Ijaz Hassan Awan
Information Commissioner

Shoaib Ahmad Siddiqui
Chief Information Commissioner

Pakistan Information Commission
Government of Pakistan
Order

Appeal No: 5298-01/2026

Aftab Ahmed Ujjan
Vs
Pakistan Mineral Development Corporation

Date: 10-03-2026 None appeared on behalf of the public body despite the issuance of two notices dated 14-01-2026 and 10-02-2026 respectively. The service of the said notices has been confirmed through Pakistan Post. It was also mentioned in the notice dated 10-02-2026 that in case no one appeared on behalf of the public body, an ex parte decision would be recorded.

2. In view of the above, the Commission is satisfied that the notices have duly been served upon the Designated Officer of the public body; however, he has failed to appear before the Commission. Therefore, there are sufficient grounds to proceed ex parte. Accordingly, the appeal is decided ex parte as under:

3. Through information request dated 20-12-2025, the applicant required the Designated Officer of the public body to provide the following information in respect of Mr. Ghulam Mujtaba, an ex-employee of PMDC:

1. *A copy of the initial advertisement issued by the PMDC HR Department.*
2. *A copy of the interview call issued by the HR Department for the said position.*
3. *A copy of the initial appointment letter issued by the HR Department to Mr. Ghulam Mujtaba at PMDC Head Office, Islamabad.*
4. *A copy of the joining report of Mr. Ghulam Mujtaba, PMDC.*
5. *A copy of the complete official inquiry conducted by PMDC management regarding the alleged fake degree of the above-mentioned employee.*
6. *A copy of the complete record of all disbursements against salaries along with other benefits, i.e., medical, bonuses, etc., from the date of joining till termination.*
7. *A copy of the responsibility-fixation proceedings against those involved in the alleged illegal appointment of the above-mentioned employee and the resulting wastage of public funds.*

4. Allegedly, the said information was not provided to the applicant within the time prescribed under Section 14(1) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017, whereby a public body is required to respond to an information request within ten (10) working days of its receipt. Therefore, the applicant filed the present appeal before the Commission.
5. The Commission has examined the contents of the information request and observes that the information/record sought by the applicant does not fall under any of the exemptions provided in the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017, and pertains to public record maintained by the public body.
6. In view of the above, the appeal is allowed. Mr. Usman Ahmed Batth, Designated Officer / Public Information Officer, PMDC, is directed to furnish the required information to the applicant within ten (10) working days.
7. Copy of this order be also sent to the Managing Director, PMDC, for implementation.
8. Adjourned for hearing on 22-04-2026.

Ijaz Hassan Awan
Information Commissioner

Shoaib Ahmad Siddiqui
Chief Information Commissioner

Pakistan Information Commission
Government of Pakistan
Order

Appeal No: 5206-11/2025

Waqas Aziz

Vs

National Vocational & Technical Training Commission (NAVTTTC)

- Date: 10-03-2026 None is present. The public body, vide letter dated 02-02-2026, furnished the certified copies of the required information, which were shared with the applicant. The applicant acknowledged the same vide email dated 09-03-2026 and submitted that he has not been provided with the copies of the proposed trades and seats, institute-wise, recommended and signed by the Regional Scrutiny Committee, along with the justification and seat allocation criteria.
2. The Commission has examined the information placed on record and observes that the information now sought by the applicant in his rejoinder was not part of the original information request filed by him. Therefore, the same is beyond the scope of the present appeal.
3. In view of the above, no further proceedings are required in the matter and the appeal stands disposed of accordingly.

Ijaz Hassan Awan
Information Commissioner

Shoaib Ahmad Siddiqui
Chief Information Commissioner

Pakistan Information Commission
Government of Pakistan
Order

Appeal No: 5282-01/2025

Muhammad Saeed

Vs

Water and Power Development Authority (WAPDA)

- Date: 10-03-2026 None is present. The public body, vide letter dated 30-01-2026, informed that the post of Manager General Services pertains to M/s NESPAK and no such position exists within WAPDA. It has further been submitted that the individual concerned is not an employee of WAPDA; therefore, no record or payment vouchers relating to his salary or other particulars are available with WAPDA.
2. A copy of the written reply was shared with the applicant, who acknowledged the same vide email dated 06-02-2026 and stated that NESPAK is a consultant under WAPDA in respect of the construction of Diamer Basha Dam and that approval of the consultant staff is required from the client under the contractual provisions. Therefore, according to the applicant, the reply of WAPDA is not acceptable.
3. The Commission has examined the contents of the information request, the written reply of the public body, and the rejoinder filed by the applicant. Admittedly, the position for which the required information has been sought pertains to NESPAK, which is a consultant of WAPDA. The service record relating to the said position is also not maintained by WAPDA; rather, it is maintained by NESPAK. Therefore, WAPDA cannot be directed to furnish the said information.
4. The applicant is, however, at liberty to approach the concerned quarter for obtaining the same. No further proceedings are required in the matter. The appeal stands disposed of accordingly. Copy of this 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: 5149-12/2025

Saadia Mazhar
Vs
National Cyber Crime Investigation Agency (NCCIA)

Date: 10-03-2026 None present.

2. Information furnished by the public body vide letter dated 09-02-2026 which was shared with the applicant vide notice dated 13-02-2026 under RGL No. 170311529. 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
Order

Appeal No: 4374-01/2025

Nauman Ali Haider
Vs
Capital Development Authority (CDA)

Date: 10-03-2026

None present.

2. On last date of hearing information furnished by the representative of the public body in shape of letter dated 22-09-2025 which was shared with the applicant vide notice dated 11-02-2026 under RGL No. 170311551. 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

