

Pakistan Information Commission

Government of Pakistan

Order

Appeal No 4993-10/2025

Muhammad Sajjad Hussain

Vs

National Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (NEECA)

March 25,2026

Ms. Mehwish Khan, PIO, NEECA appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. Information furnished by the public body was shared with the applicant vide letter dated 19-02-2026 under RGL No. 146097691. A period of more than 20 days as required under the 170311948 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

Order

Appeal No 5233-12/2025

Ch. Rizwan Ellahi

Vs

Excise and Taxation Department

March 25, 2026

None appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. The public body, vide letter dated 9.2.2026, furnished written reply answering all the queries of the applicant along with copies of the relevant documents. The information was shared with the applicant vide letter dated 11.02.2026, who has acknowledged its receipt but, vide email dated 2.3.2026, has shown dissatisfaction over the shared information, stating that it does not fulfil the requirements of his information request.
2. It is further submitted that the respondent has provided incomplete information; therefore, request is made to provide complete information.
3. The Commission has examined the contents of the information request, memo of the appeal, written reply furnished by the public body, documents annexed with that, rejoinder of the applicant, and the relevant law on the matter.
4. The respondent/public body has provided all the relevant information and documents except the record of supervision/performance report of Inspector and Hawaldar of the Excise and Taxation Department, namely Imran Khattak and Khalid Niaz, respectively.
5. As far as complaints received during the last years are concerned, it is stated that no complaint has been received.
6. As far as the record of the Inspector and Hawaldar of the Excise and Taxation Department who intercepted the tampered vehicles is concerned, this record is confidential and is not mentioned as public record under Section 6 of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017; hence, it cannot be treated as public record. In addition to that, Section 7(g) excludes certain information/record from disclosure relating to the personal privacy of an individual; therefore, the said record cannot be disclosed under the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017. The remaining information has been found complete and

addresses the information request. 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 5224-12/2025

Aun Ali

Vs

Prime Minister's Office

March 25, 2026

None appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. The public body, vide letter dated 24-10-2025, has furnished a written reply answering all the queries of the information request along with copies of the relevant documents and showing details of the staff of the concerned hospital and budget allocation. Copy of the said response was shared with the applicant, who has acknowledged its receipt but has stated that the measures taken by the public body for the smooth running of the concerned hospital are not sufficient and that health facilities are insufficient.
2. The Commission has examined the information request and the written reply furnished by the public body point-wise. Rejoinder has also been perused. It is found that all the queries of the applicant have been adequately answered and the information stands shared with the applicant. The points raised by the applicant do not concern this Commission and can be raised at the appropriate forum. The responsibility of the Commission is to collect the information from the concerned public body in accordance with the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017 and share it with the applicant, and the Commission has performed its duty.
3. The applicant has been provided sufficient data to take up the matter for better health facilities for the people of the area. He may take up the matter with the Chief Secretary and Chief Minister of Gilgit-Baltistan. 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 5272-01/2026

Waqas Aziz

Vs

Department of Archaeology and Museums

March 25, 2026

None appeared on behalf of the public body. The appeal was allowed and the public body was directed to furnish the required information to the applicant. The public body, in compliance with the order of the Commission, furnished the required information, which was shared with the applicant vide letter dated 26-02-2026 under RGL No. 170312032. The applicant, vide his email dated 24-03-2026, has acknowledged its receipt and has expressed satisfaction over the information provided by 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 5120-11/2025

Aashir Ali

Vs

President Office

March 25,2026

None appeared on behalf of the public body; however, the public body, vide letter dated 11-03-2026, has intimated that the Islamabad High Court, in its order passed in Writ Petition No. 784/2020 titled Election Commission of Pakistan vs Pakistan Information Commission, etc., has held that the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017 does not apply to constitutional bodies, including the Election Commission of Pakistan and the office of the President of Pakistan.

2. An extract of the relevant para-21 of the judgment has been annexed with the written reply. In view of the observations of the Islamabad High Court, the case is not proceedable; hence, 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 5121-11/2025

Aashir Ali

Vs

President Office

March 25,2026

None appeared on behalf of the public body; however, the public body, vide letter dated 11-03-2026, has intimated that the Islamabad High Court, in its order passed in Writ Petition No. 784/2020 titled Election Commission of Pakistan vs Pakistan Information Commission, etc., has held that the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017 does not apply to constitutional bodies, including the Election Commission of Pakistan and the office of the President of Pakistan.

2. An extract of the relevant para-21 of the judgment has been annexed with the written reply. In view of the observations of the Islamabad High Court, the case is not proceedable; hence, 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 4536-02/2025

Amir Baloch

Vs

Pakistan Nursing and Midwifery Council (PNMC)

March 25, 2026

None appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. Information furnished by the public body was shared with the applicant vide letter dated 13-02-2026 under RGL No. 170311782. 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

Order

Appeal No 4469-02/2025

Nadeem Tanoli

Vs

Commission on Science and Technology for Sustainable Development (COMSATS)

March 25, 2026

Amna Ali Advocate appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. This appeal was filed on Feb 02, 2025 by the applicant against Commission on Science and Technology for Sustainable Development (COMSATS). Various notices were issued to the COMSATS by the Commission to appear before the Commission and respond to the information request/appeal filed by the applicant, but in vain. In view of the time limit provided in the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017 under Section 17 regarding the period for deciding the appeal, the Commission was left with no option but to pass an ex parte order. This had already been mentioned in the notices issued to COMSATS. Accordingly, the Commission passed an order on April 09, 2025 directing the Executive Director, COMSATS, to provide permissible information under the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017 to the applicant as well as to this Commission within 10 days of the receipt of the order.
2. COMSATS did not comply with the order and instead filed a review petition stating that they may be provided with an opportunity to be heard on merits. In view of the pressing arguments of the learned advocate, she was provided with an opportunity time and again to present her arguments. She subsequently stated that COMSATS is an intergovernmental organization and does not come under the purview of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017. She has been seeking adjournments in view of her meetings with the representatives of COMSATS to gain clarity, which unfortunately could not take place for one reason or the other. Today, the learned counsel has categorically stated that the information sought by the applicant relates to a provincial scheme.
3. This is a relevant point as the funding and support for the scheme would come from the province. Without going into the question of the applicability of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017 on COMSATS, we would like to dispose of the appeal in the manner that, since this scheme pertains to a province, the

applicant may like to approach the KP Information Commission for seeking details of the funding and its execution.

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 5081-11/2025

Uzair Razzaq

Vs

Cabinet Division

March 25, 2026

Dr. Asma Raza Aslam, Section Officer, Cabinet Division and Abdul Maillk, Superintendent (in person), appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. The public body, vide letter dated 19-03-2026, has filed a written reply. Let it be shared with the applicant for filing rejoinder, if any.
2. On the last date of hearing, nobody appeared on behalf of the public body, in spite of the fact that on 22-01-2026 Abdul Malik, Superintendent, Cabinet Division, appeared before this Commission and a copy of the rejoinder was handed over to him for response. However, on 22-01-2026, nobody appeared on behalf of the public body; therefore, a show cause notice was issued to Abdul Malik, Superintendent, Cabinet Division, under Section 20 (1)(f) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017.
3. Written reply to the show cause notice has been furnished by the said officer, submitting that he appeared before this Commission on 22-01-2026 and was informed that the applicant was not present and that the reply submitted by the Cabinet Division would be provided to the applicant for his acceptance. However, he stated that he was not provided with a copy of the rejoinder, nor was he informed about the next date of hearing.
4. The reply furnished by Abdul Malik, Superintendent, Cabinet Division, is contrary to the record. It is mentioned in the order dated 22-01-2026 that the said officer was handed a copy of the rejoinder for filing its response. Presumption of truth is attached to the order of the Commission unless proved otherwise.
5. In view of the above, the reply to the show cause notice filed by Abdul Malik, Superintendent, Cabinet Division, is found unsatisfactory and is hence turned down. He is liable to be proceeded against under Section 20 (1)(f) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017.

6. Due to the above-mentioned conduct of the Superintendent, Cabinet Division, the order of the Commission has not been implemented, and the said officer is amenable under Section 20 (1)(e) read with 20 (1)(f) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017.
7. Accordingly, a penalty of 10 days is imposed on Abdul Malik, Superintendent, Cabinet Division, and the Secretary, Cabinet Division, and Accountant General, AGPR, are directed to deduct 10 days' salary of Abdul Malik, Superintendent, Cabinet Division, in the next month and submit a compliance report before the next date of hearing. Copy of the order shall be sent to the Secretary, Cabinet Division, and Accountant General, AGPR, for implementation.
8. Adjourned to 28-04-2026

Ijaz Hassan Awan
Information Commissioner

Shoaib Ahmad Siddiqui
Chief Information Commissioner

Pakistan Information Commission

Government of Pakistan

Order

Appeal No 5147-11/2025

Dr. Tariq Mahmood Bangash

Vs

Islamabad Wildlife Management Board (IWMB)

March 25, 2026

Ayesha Shahzad, Assistant Director, IWMB appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. The public body, vide letter dated 19-02-2026, addressed to the applicant, shared partial information, whereas today, vide letter dated 19-03-2026, has submitted that the remaining information, comprising 30 minutes of operational review meetings, has also been shared with the applicant. The applicant, vide email dated 03-03-2026, has acknowledged receipt of the minutes of the meeting after payment of the fee, whereas he submitted that minutes of operational meetings were still pending, which are now shared with him vide letter dated 19-03-2026. A copy of the said letter should again be shared with the applicant. No further proceedings are required. The appeal stands disposed of.

Ijaz Hassan Awan
Information Commissioner

Shoaib Ahmad Siddiqui
Chief Information Commissioner

Pakistan Information Commission

Government of Pakistan

Order

Appeal No 5215-12/2025

Agha Hassan Khurshid

Vs

Zarai Taraqiati Bank Limited (ZTBL)

March 25, 2026

Ch. Adeel Ashraf, SVP / PIO and Muhammad Usman, OG-II,
ZTBL appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. The public body, vide letter dated 10-02-2026, furnished a written reply answering all three questions of the information request, along with a copy of Chapter 19 of the HR Manual, ZTBL. The written reply, along with the annexed documents, was shared with the applicant, who, vide email dated 28-02-2026, acknowledged its receipt but expressed disaffection thereover and stated that ZTBL had not dealt with his case in accordance with the statutory requirements. The Commission has examined the contents of the information request, the written reply, and the rejoinder filed by the applicant and has found that all three queries of the applicant have been properly answered, which address the information request. No further proceedings are required in this case. 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 5138-11/2025

Dr. Muhammad Amin

Vs

Zarai Taraqiati Bank Limited (ZTBL)

March 25, 2026

Applicant present in person. Ch. Adeel Ashraf, SVP / PIO and Muhammad Usman, OG-II, ZTBL appeared on behalf of the public body.

1. The appeal has been lingering, and a series of rejoinders have been sent to the Commission, which were shared with the public body, which has given its response. Despite all these efforts, the applicant is not satisfied.
2. So, in order to resolve the controversies, the Commission is now examining the information request and seeking a response from the representative of the public body and the applicant present before the Commission as under:

In response to Serial No. 1 of the information request, the representative of the public body states that the authorized officer is competent to initiate proceedings under E&D Rules and he does not need any approval.

In response to Serial No. 2 – the representative of the public body categorically states that there was no complaint against the applicant.

In response to Serial No. 3 – the representative of the public body states that no separate copy of reply is available and the factual position is incorporated in the inquiry report that has been provided to the applicant.

In response to Serial No. 4 – the representative of the public body states that the SVP (HRD) heard the applicant personally and no reply from him is available on the record.

In response to Serial No. 5 – the representative of the public body states that no record is available and the inquiry report is detailed, which contains the necessary response.

In response to Serial No. 6 – the representative of the public body states that he was not in the merit list when promotion was made in 2007 and 2009.

In response to Serial No. 7 – Response to Query No. 7 is aptly mentioned in the response of the public body dated 10-02-2026.

In response to Serial No. 8 – the representative of the public body states that the authorized officer derives his authority from E&D Regulations 1975 and no separate orders are issued in this regard.

In response to Serial No. 9 – the representative of the public body states that no specific order of the Chairman is required. The ADP Regulations have been provided to the applicant.

3. In view of this categorical examination conducted in the presence of the parties, no further proceedings are needed. The applicant can utilize any shortcoming in the action taken against him at the relevant forums. 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