

Pakistan Information Commission

Government Of Pakistan

Camp Office, Lahore

Order

Appeal No: 3414-01/2024

Zahid Hussain Wasim

Vs

Sui Northern Gas Pipeline Limited

- October 22, 2024 Barrister Muhammad Ali and Shahzad Rizwan, Deputy Chief Officer appeared on behalf of the public body.
2. In compliance with the order of the Commission, the public body furnished certified copies of the required documents/information which was shared with the appellant vide notice dated 04-09-24 under RGL No. 139877903 but no response has been received from the appellant having any objection over the shared information. It appears that the appellant is satisfied with the response of the public body. No further proceedings are required. The appeal stands disposed of.
 3. 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, Lahore

Order

Appeal No: 3823-08/24

Naeem Ahmed

Vs

Faisalabad Electric Supply Company

October 22, 2024

Tahir Mehmood Sheikh, Additional DG (PR), FESCO appeared on behalf of the public body.

2. The information furnished by the public body was shared with the appellant vide letter dated 11-09-2024 under RGL No. 139878229 but no response has been received from him. It appears that the appellant is satisfied with the response of the public body. No further proceedings are required. The appeal stands disposed of.
3. 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, Lahore

Order

Appeal No: 3823-08/24

Naeem Ahmed

Vs

Gujranwala Electric Supply Company

October 22, 2024

Muhammad Zafar, Deputy Manager (Procurement), GEPCO appeared on behalf of the public body.

2. The information furnished by the public body was shared with the appellant vide letter dated 11-09-2024 under RGL No. 139878227 but no response has been received from him. It appears that the appellant is satisfied with the response of the public body. No further proceedings are required. The appeal stands disposed of.
3. 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, Lahore

Order

Appeal No: 3825-08/24

Zahid Hussain Wasim

Vs

Multan Electric Supply Company

October 22, 2024

None appeared on behalf of the public body.

2. The information furnished by the public body was shared with the appellant vide letter dated 11-09-2024 under RGL No. 139878225 but no response has been received from him. It appears that the appellant is satisfied with the response of the public body. No further proceedings are required. The appeal stands disposed of.
3. 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, Lahore

Order

Appeal No: 3845-08/24

Muhammad Ishaq

Vs

Faisalabad Electric Supply Company

October 22, 2024

Appellant present in person. Tahir Mehmood Sheikh, Additional DG (PR), FESCO appeared on behalf of the public body.

2. The public body has furnished written reply. Information/documents required by the appellant vide letter dated 18-10-24 as per flag-A to Flag-F however, about the information/document cited at Serial No. 8 of the information request it is stated that no document has been sought by the appellant and reasons is asked for non-adoption of GOP/PESCO letters without refereeing any particular letter so information sought at Serial No. 8 of the information request does not fulfill the requirement of the Section 11 (3) of the Right of Access to Information, 2017 having no detail t enable the public body to locate it. As far as information required at Serial No. 9 is concerned, the public body has submitted that the seniority list of LFM-I, MRSS and BAOS is not maintained whereas the appellant has objected that reply of the said information is false one. When the public body with responsibility has informed that it is not maintaining the seniority list, if the appellant considers that the said information is false, he may file complaint against the public body under the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017. Regarding information cited at Serial 15 (b) of the information request, the public body has submitted that said information consists of 430 pages and it can be provided to the appellant on deposit of photocopying charges @ Rs 20/- per page. However according to the Access to Information (Fee Regulations) 2022, 20 pages are to be shared free of cost and for the remaining information Rs 7/- per page can be charged. As the public body has already shared more than 20

pages free of cost to the appellant, therefore, the said information be provided to the appellant at Rs 7/- per page, subject to deposit of said charges

3. As far as information required at Serial 15 (d) of the information request is concerned, the appellant has sought terms and conditions of tenders and contracts without specifying any contract and agreement and this query also does not fulfill the requirement of the Section 11 (3) of the Right of Access to Information Act, 2017 having no detail to enable the public body to locate it.
4. About information cited at Serial 15 (e), (k) and 16 the public body has categorically mentioned that said information is available on the website of the public body.
5. Copy of the written reply along with its enclosures (Flag-A to F) has been provided to the appellant. If the appellant has apprehension of any false information provided to the appellant he may file a complaint under the law. 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