ORDER
THE PUNJAB INFORMATION COMMISSION

Complaints # 27-11-2025-3, 27-11-2025-4, 27-11-2025-5, 27-11-2025-6, 27-11-2025-7, 27-11-2025-8, 27-11-2025-9, 27-11-2025-10, 27-11-2025-11, 27-11-2025-12, 27-11-2025-13, 27-11-2025-14, 27-11-2025-15, 22-12-2025-1, 22-12-2025-2, 22-12-2025-3, 22-12-2025-4, 22-12-2025-5, 22-12-2025-6, 22-12-2025-7, 22-12-2025-8, 22-12-2025-9, 22-12-2025-10, 22-12-2025-11, 22-12-2025-12, 22-12-2025-13, 22-12-2025-14, 22-12-2025-15, 22-12-2025-16, 22-12-2025-17, 22-12-2025-18, 22-12-2025-19, 22-12-2025-20, 22-12-2025-21, 22-12-2025-22

Attique-ur-Rehman

vs

Irrigation Department of Different Districts

Subject: **RTI Complaint Regarding Non-Provision of Public Information under the Punjab Transparency and Right to Information Act 2013**

16.03.2026 Complainant earlier approached this Commission by filing forty-five 45 complaints, all seeking information from various offices of Irrigation Department all across Punjab. The said complaints were filed on the letter head of and holding Complainant out as office bearer of Pakistan Irrigation Employees (Power) Union. During inquiry conducted by this Commission, it revealed that the aforesaid Union is no more registered with the regulator i.e. NIRC. Complainant was summoned to explain the above and upon his failure to justify his demand under the aforesaid Union, the said complaints were disposed of. Complainant has now filed thirty-five (35) complaints again addressed to various offices of Irrigation Department of Punjab. All thirty-five (35) RTI Applications filed with respective offices of Irrigation Department are identical. A printed performa is used for filing RTI Applications and only name of public body and year is inserted in the same. It is also pertinent to highlight that RTI Application in Complaint # 22-12-2025-19 appended with the said complaint is blank and only printed performa is attached. Contents of the said RTI Applications are also vague since neither any work nor any vehicle is identified and all record of the year mentioned therein relating to work and cost of fuel and maintenance of all cars is sought. Not only that such requests without clear identification does not fulfill mandatory criteria prescribed in Section 10(3)

CamScanner

of RTI Act, 2013, large number of complaints filed against one department seeking identical record from its various districts and divisional offices calls for evaluation of appropriateness of such requests since this case appears to be a repetitive misuse of RTI Act, 2013.

2. Respondent public body had earlier apprised this Commission in Complaint # 19-8-2025-16 (disposed of vide order dated 10.11.2025) that the Complainant has a history of filing multiple complaints against the same public body with various authorities. Such large number of complaints against same department and that too seeking identical information depict melafide of the Complainant and appears to be nothing short of an abuse of process of law and motivated to intimidate the said department. Although it is complex to visualize all types of misuse of RTI Laws, this Commission is however, making an attempt to do so by adapting a purposive construction of the said law in order to prevent the aforesaid apprehended abuse. RTI Act, 2013 is aimed at making state actions more transparent and should not be allowed to be misused so as to become a tool of obstructing regular official functions of public bodies. RTI Act, 2013 is though a beneficial law, however, when use of such law is converted into a tool for mischief, it must be checked. Accountability contemplated in preamble of RTI Act, 2013, though can only be possible upon inspection of information and record, however, such accountability should be limited to specific works. Also filing of such large number of complaints all against different bodies of one department and by a person who earlier falsely claimed to be office bearer of employees' union of the same department clearly demonstrate motive behind initiation of these proceedings; the motive being anything but seeking information related to matters of public importance. It is further observed that right of access to information must not collide with public interest like efficient operation of government functionaries and optimum use of limited fiscal and human resources. Large number of identical RTI Applications like in the present case rather than fortifying the object and mandate of RTI Act, 2013, nullifies its purpose since such misuse will not only intimidate public bodies but will also result in public losing confidence in RTI Laws. While reaching such conclusion, this Commission takes support from orders passed by Supreme Court of India in (2011)8 SCC 497 (CBSE vs Aditya

CamScanner

Bandopadhaya), Delhi High Court in W.P. (C) 845/2014 (Shail Sahni vs Sanjeev Kumar), W.P. (C) 406/2016 (Shail Sahni vs Smt Valsa Sara Mathew) and Judgement dated 28.11.2026 passed by Central Information Commission of India in Shweta Saini vs PIO Daya Ibadh Educational Institute holding that repetitive RTI Requests seeking information of large width and amplitude is nothing but abuse of RTI Laws and rather than advancing, such requests collide with public interest and convert RTI Laws into to tool of oppression and intimidation with public officials spending most of their time in collecting and disseminating information rather than executing their official duties.

3. RTI Applications of the Complainant are bereft of mandatory details prescribed in Section 10(3) of RTI Act, 2013 and the same also appear to be vexatious and for both the said reasons, these complaints are rejected.

(Bushra Saqib)
Information Commissioner

(Muhammad Maalik Bhulla)
Chief Information Commissioner

CamScanner