ORDER SHEET
THE PUNJAB INFORMATION COMMISSION

43 Plot 64Nursery lane Near China Chowk, Lahore, Punjab
Website:- https://rti.punjab.gov.pk
042-99205794

Complaint # 23-12-2025-7

Rehana Tariq

Vs

Sub Registrar Allama Iqbal Town Lahore

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

Order

19.05.2026 Complainant is present. Mr. Rehmat Ali Virk, Sub Registrar Allama Iqbal Town Lahore is present along-with Mr. Zulifqar Shah, Record Keeper on behalf of respondent public body.

2. Complainant alleges that some property owned by her was fraudulently transferred to a person. She has in her possession attested copy of sale deed dated 02.06.2015, registered on 29.06.2015 with respondent public body and desires to obtain following record;

i- Application for appointment of Local Commission (which is to be filed by the seller i.e. complainant);
ii- Permission letter issued to the said Local Commission,
iii- Report of Local Commission;
iv- Challan of fee for appointment of Local Commission and;
v- Register of respondent public body containing signatures and thumb impression of the seller i.e. complainant.

She filed RTI Application seeking the aforesaid record on 18.10.2025, which application should have been responded within fourteen (14) working days as required u/s 10 of RTI Act, 2013. Dismayed by lack of response from the said public body, complainant filed this complaint on 23.12.2025. Despite notice the said public body did not attend the proceedings for four consecutive dates of hearing, thus hampering

CamScanner

disposal of this complaint within prescribed statutory period. Upon issuance of show cause notice to Mr. Rehmat Ali Virk, Sub-Registrar, Allama Iqbal Town, Lahore/respondent public body first telephonically sought adjournment and again absented itself from these proceedings. Adjournment once sought was only to dilute penal proceedings u/s 15 of RTI Act, 2013, which were initiated on 26.02.2026 by issuance of show cause notice to the aforesaid officer. First irrelevant record was submitted on 01.04.2026. Despite initiation of ex-parte proceedings, the aforesaid officer failed to appear on 21.04.2026, rather a record keeper appeared and verbally stated non-availability of sought record. At this point complainant pointed out that the said record keeper has earlier responded to RTI Application vide reply dated 09.04.2026, copy of which is also submitted by the complainant. The said reply depicts a rather disappointing situation where a record keeper rather than a duly notified Public Information Officer or Sub Registrar himself responded to RTI Application, which mandate is reserved for either PIO or Head of Department (HOD) under RTI Act, 2013. The aforesaid reply dated 09.04.2026 was addressed to this Commission but was never submitted by respondent public body, which only gave the said reply to the complainant, seemingly in order to discourage her. The aforesaid reply named different officials to state that record sought by the complainant is with them. Only document mentioned at Sr.No.5 of RTI Application was submitted.

3. Today, Mr. Rehmat Ali Virk, Sub Registrar, appeared and filed reply to show cause notice stating that on 26.12.2025 he was summoned to appear before learned Civil Judge, 1st Class. Notice issued by said learned Court for attendance on 26.12.2026 is appended with the said reply, in which the aforesaid officer states that due to being present in the aforesaid court, he could not appear before this Commission. Not only that this complaint was never fixed on 26.12.2025 but also show cause notice was issued to him for deliberately withholding information beyond mandatory statutory period and not for his failure to attend proceedings before this Commission. His reply does not contain any explanation qua charge

CamScanner

of withholding information/failure to provide information within statutory period, neither any such explanation was verbally offered by the aforesaid officer. Accordingly explanation mentioned in the aforesaid reply is rejected.

4. As for RTI request of the complainant, the aforesaid officer filed reply dated 19.05.2026. The said reply does not contain any statement rather contains contention based on hearsay while referring to statement made by Sub-Registrar Allama Iqbal Town. The said reply again named different officials and states that those officials and not respondent public body has the relevant record. When asked to explain, the said officer stated that said officials are no longer posted with respondent public body and have taken all the record with them. Earlier he has filed a report dated 30.03.2026 bearing his signatures forwarding a report which states that after perusal of available record, it transpires that the sale transaction was recorded after fulfilling all legal formalities. The said report endorsed by Sub-Registrar himself confirms existence of record, after perusal of which validity of relevant transaction was confirmed by him.

5. Despite providing several opportunities, the aforesaid Sub-Registrar never attempted to recover the said record (if the same has been illegally taken by concerned officials). Nor has he submitted any report that any effort was made for retrieval of such significant record.

6. Conduct of Mr. Rehmat Ali Virk, Sub-Registrar Allama Iqbal Town, Lahore clearly prove that he not only failed to furnish information within prescribed time limit but he also submitted incomplete, misleading and contradictory information pertaining to record sought by the complainant. Article19-A of the Constitution and also RTI Act, 2013 are beneficial provisions and citizens are encouraged to seek any information irrespective of their personal nexus. It is rather appalling that respondent public body is denying the complainant of information and record, procurement of which is her right in its own. Mischief mentioned in Section-15 of RTI Act, 2013 having been established against Rehmat Ali Virk, Sub-Registrar Allama Iqbal Town, Lahore and penalty of fine Rs. 50,000/- is

CamScanner

imposed on him. The said amount shall be deducted from his salary and for this purpose copy of this order shall be sent to District Account Office, Lahore as well as Accountant General of Punjab.

7. Copy of this order shall also be sent to Deputy Commissioner, Lahore and Commissioner Lahore Division for information and necessary action, if warranted.

(Bushra Saqib)
Information Commissioner

(Muhammad Malik Bhulla)
Chief Information Commissioner

CamScanner