



J&K State Information Commission
Old Assembly Complex, Srinagar . 0194-2506661
Wazarat Road, Near DC office , Jammu. 0191-2520937.
www.jksic.nic.in

File No: SIC/K/SA/37/2015
Decision No: SIC/K/SA/37/2015/790

Author: G. R. Sufi, Chief Information Commissioner, J&K.

CORAM: Shri G. R. Sufi, IRS (Retd.), Chief Information Commissioner, Shri Nazir Ahmad, State Information Commissioner.

Title: Shri G.N. Yattoo

Versus

PIO, Sher-e-Kashmir Institute of Medical Sciences, Soura.

Reserved on: 29-07-2015

Decision on: -08-2015

1. Dr. G.N Yattoo, a resident of the state while exercising his right conferred on him to seek information filed an RTI application before the PIO SKIMS, Srinagar on 29.12.2014 seeking the following information:

1. Action taken by the SKIMS administration after the molestation charges with the female patient against the concerned doctor were proved by the enquiry committee b) service records of the said doctor from his service book to verify the entry of records regarding the penalty imposed on him by the SKIMS administration c) annual performance reports (APRs) of the said doctor on the basis of which he has been getting promotions despite such heinous charges which have been proved against him.

2. information regarding a) the outcome of the letter forwarded to the Competent Authority by the SKIMS administration recommending therein the immediate suspension of the said doctor b) the attendance statement of the said doctor signed by the HOD of the month in which he was caught indulging in private practice by the Government agencies c) the report from the enquiry committee constituted in this behalf by the SKIMS administration d) the report from the vigilance/crime department as indulging in private practice at SKIMS is a criminal act e) the details of the retrospective service benefits as Professor Gastroenterology given to the said doctor after doing this criminal act of private practice.”
3. Information regarding a) the house allotment committee rules regarding the allotment of official accommodation to the SKIMS faculty members b) despite being much junior to the undersigned, how these two faculty members have been allowed to utilize the said room as their official accommodation in violation of all rules and regulations c) the allotment order by virtue of which the said room has been allotted to the two junior faculty members”.

2. The PIO passed an order on 10.2.2015 denying the information to the information seeker invoking section 8(1)(i). Being aggrieved by the denial of information, the appellant preferred first appeal before FAA on 19.2.2015 praying for a direction by the FAA to the PIO SKIMS to “release the information sought as section 11 was not applicable in the instant case.” He further submitted in his appeal that the denial of information in this case was not only in total contravention of RTI Rules (SIC law) which defeats the aim and object of the Act. The FAA disposed of the appeal on 19.3.2015. The FAA in a cryptic order relying on the decision of Hon’ble Supreme Court in SLP No: 7734 of 2012 (Girish R.Deshpande V/s CIC & Others has upheld the decision of the PIO. Again being aggrieved by the cryptic order of the FAA, the appellant preferred second appeal in this

Commission on 8.5.2015 requesting the Commission for a direction to the PIO to disclose the information. As this appeal pertained to SIC (K), therefore, he held the initial hearing vide his notice under No: SIC/K/SA/37/2015/801-3 dated: 20.5.2015. The Commissioner heard the PIO, the appellant and later on Dr. Gul Javed and Dr. Altaf Shah, whom the PIO had arrayed as third party in his submission before the Commission and not in his original order. As a larger point of law arose and facts emerged whether the information sought falls under Section 8, therefore, appeal was referred to larger bench. The Chief Information Commissioner vide his order dated: 02-05-2015 constituted Larger Bench for adjudication of the Appeal.

3. The appellant, while assailing the orders of the below authorities before the Commission, has submitted that the decision of the PIO SKIMS and the findings of the FAA are bad in law as the information sought is about the disposal/implementation of the show cause notice and the government order as referred to above and not any personal information about the concerned persons. He has further contested the PIO's action of invoking section 11 and has stated that section 11 under the facts and in the circumstances of the case is not applicable. The decision taken by the FAA and the PIO "defeats the very objective and aim of the J&K State RTI Act, 2009" for which it was enacted. The appellant has further assailed the counter statement and reply filed by the PIO and has stated that the procedure followed by the PIO was violative of the provisions of the Act. He has stated that the formal procedure of seeking objections of the third parties has not been followed. Notices to the third parties were issued beyond the statutory time and that the information sought by the appellant

is not covered by the definition of exemption from the disclosure of information under section 8 because the information pertains to the public interest. The information sought is in public interest and withholding of information would amount to infringement of fundamental right of the appellant and thus defeat the public interest. He has further submitted that various circulars and orders of the SKIMS have provided for disciplinary proceedings to be initiated against the doctors, who were doing private practice, which has been proved detrimental to the public interest at large. In spite of standing instructions of the Institute itself, some delinquent doctors have been violating government orders and the doctor about whom the information was sought and who was found to have violated the standing directions and orders of the institute and government has not been dealt with in accordance with law. The appellant has also relied on the Hon'ble Chief Minister's directions and Divisional Commissioner's inspection report. The information pertaining to the proceedings concluded by the enquiry committee in relation to said doctor's misconduct is information which cannot be termed as personal information, because it relates to the public interest at large because by banning private practice, the intention was to give a quality treatment to the public at large in SKIMS. Action of any doctor not to follow strictly the ban imposed on private practice is detrimental to the public interest at large which cannot be treated to be the protected information. The enquiry report is a public document and public at large are qualified to have such an information. Reliance has been placed on section 8(2) which empowers a public authority to allow access to information even when the Officers Secrets Act 1923 or any of the exemption clauses in section 8(1) are applicable. As the said doctor has " willfully and deliberately " observed the government

order banning the private practice in breach and has invaded the public interest by choosing to render his services against the consideration, therefore, he is not covered under section 8(1) (i). The appellant has also referred to section 5 of the Prevention of Corruption Act which has been amended by addition of sub clause 2(a) which reads as under:-

“Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1) a member of medical or para-medical staff of the SKIMS, Srinagar shall be deemed to have committed the offence of criminal misconduct if he resorts to private practice in any form or manner”.

A reference has also been made under OWP (PIL)60 of 2006, wherein Hon’ble J&K High Court in its order dated: 14.8.2007 had directed the Vigilance Organization to ensure proper ban on private practice done by government doctors. Therefore, under this enormous legal and factual evidence and support PIO’s order that the information sought was of personal nature, is devoid of merit and Commission is requested to order vacation of such finding, because withholding of information of such magnitude and of public importance and trust will amount to miscarriage of justice.

4. Similarly, the appellant has strongly contested the PIO’s action of not disclosing information on point 1(a) of RTI application, i.e., “the action taken by SKIMS Administration after molestation charges with the female patient against the concerned doctor were proved by the enquiry committee.” The appellant stated that the reasons given by the PIO are neither justified nor have any proximity with the provisions of Right to Information Act. As per documents enclosed with the appeal, a show cause

notice was issued to Dr. Altaf Shah on 24.8.1998. The appellant has requested for information regarding action taken by SKIMS on this show cause notice. A doctor represents noble profession and is a symbol of hope and faith for a patient. The patient believes none other than the doctor who is supposed to have high moral and ethical values as averted by the appellant. Report on what the SKIMS called "uncivilized conduct with a lady patient" is in public domain and society has a right to access this information. The appellant submits that the PIO had not brought anything on record to suggest that disclosure of third party information before the committee of sexual harassment does not outweigh the public interest. Nothing has been brought on record to suggest that when third parties gave statements without treating the evidence confidential their submissions, deposition and evidences be treated as confidential. Thus assailing the PIOs order as non-speaking the appellant has prayed the Commission to order for disclosure of this information because it overweighs the individual interest. While concluding the appellant has relied on this Commission's judgment under No: SIC/CO/SA/232/2015/727 dated: 9.2.2015 wherein the Commission has ordered disclosure of information in similar facts and circumstances.

5. In his counter statement, the PIO has defended his action by stating that as the information sought falls under the definition of personal information within the ambit of section 8 of the Act and , therefore, objections were called from the third parties and considering Central Information Commission's decision dated: 26.6.2013 and Ministry of Personnel and Public Grievances & Pensions, Government of India's Circular dated: 11.2.2013 and 14.8.2013, the information was not

disclosed. The PIO avers that he had also considered Hon'ble Supreme Court's decision in the case of Girish R. Deshpande V/s CIC and others in SLP© No:277734 of 2012, the information was denied.

6. Commission has fulfilled the requirement of giving a reasonable opportunity of being heard to the two doctors vide Commission's notice under No: SIC/K/37/2015-997-98 dated: 8.6.2015 and in compliance to this reasonable opportunity, both the doctors, who are subject matter of information appeared before the Commission and were heard and they also filed written submissions. The Commission has considered their written submissions. There is nothing in the written submissions which will substantially prove that the information pertaining to them and sought for disclosure by the appellant falls under the category of personal information. The objections given by Dr. Altaf Shah are not substantiated with facts and law to show that the information called by the information seeker is personal in nature and has to be denied to him either under section 11 or section 8. He has simply stated that the information seeker "is a professional litigant and has spent most of time in courts working against his colleagues and seniors". Dismissing the molestation charges as conspiracy against him, objector has raised the legal issue whether information falls under the category of personal or an information which has to be disclosed. There are also some other personal allegations against the appellant. However, the other third party, Dr. Gul Javed in his objections has admitted that the charges were enquired by the enquiry committee and a charge sheet was framed against him for doing private practice in violation of Government orders and disciplinary committee had decided to take a lenient view in the matter and he was advised to be

“cautious” in future. Therefore, he has objected the disclosure of information under section 8. He has also referred to Hon’ble Court’s decision, wherein they have said that private practice would not constitute a crime or corruption under the Prevention of Corruption Act.

7. Commission has gone through the facts of the case, perused the RTI applications of the applicant, minutely studied, examined and scrutinized the orders passed by the PIO and FAA, has given due consideration to the appellant’s detailed submissions and objections of two doctors carefully and gone through the provisions of law and facts of the case. The appellant has assailed the orders of FAA and the PIO not only on substantive legal points but on procedural aspects as well. The Commission would concentrate mainly on the substantive provisions of RTI Act contained in sections 8 and 11, though it would be relevant to state that initially the PIO in his order passed under section 7 on 10.2.2015 refuses to disclose information invoking section 8(i) of J&K State RTI Act, 2009 coupled with his reliance on Central Information Commission’s decision dated: 26.6.2013 and a notification of Ministry of Personnel and Public Grievances and Pensions under No: 11/2/13-IR(PL) dated: 14.8.2013. However, subsequently while filing written submissions before this Commission in response to the notice of the Commission under No: SIC/K/SA/37/2015/801-3 dated: 20.5.2015, he has impliedly invoked section 11 by providing opportunity to these two parties for filing their objections. If section 8(1)(i) is to be invoked, then there was no such need for the PIO to provide such opportunity for giving objections. However, if the intention of the PIO was to invoke section 11, he should have kept in view the provisions of section 11, which provide that except in the case of

trade or commercial secrets protected by law, disclosure may be allowed if the public interest in disclosure outweighs in importance any harm or injury to the interests of such third party. Similarly, the PIO and FAA had to invoke section 11(3) which enjoins upon them that after seeking objections to make a decision as to whether or not to disclose the information or record. The overwhelming nature of information sought is a case of extreme public importance and a issue which over weighs the private interest. It relates to open violation and challenge to government authority by not following the government orders which were in force at the time for not doing any private practice and disclosing the information which relates to the breach of trust of a patient which she had placed in a doctor to treat her in a hospital which is a public place. In the Commission's considered opinion if the PIO was right to seek the objections of the third parties then in view of express provisions of section 11, he was not bound simply to accept those objections without applying his mind to the fact whether the disclosure which is sought, overweighs the private interests and any injury, if caused to any private interest. Section 8(1)(i) which the PIO has invoked to reject the request for information is as under:-

- (1) Notwithstanding anything contained in the Act, there shall be no obligation to give any citizen:-
 - (i) information which relates to personal information the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest, or which would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the individual unless the Public Information Officer or the appellate authority, as the case may be, is satisfied that the larger public interest justifies the disclosure of such information.

Unfortunately, the PIO and his senior authority, i.e. FAA, who is under legal obligation under this act to behave like a quasi judicial authority and not an administrative authority to safeguard his junior officer, failed to appreciate the overwhelming provisions of law in safeguarding larger public interest rather than a personal interest. There is a clear direction for the authorities that disclosure of information has to be made if the larger public interest justifies same. Is not the information with regard to private practice, in the opinion of the PIO and FAA, a larger public interest? What is larger for them is to safeguard his officers interest. These authorities were required to follow the following provision of law:-

“ If the PIO or the FAA as the case may be is satisfied that the larger public interest justifies the disclosure of information then that information has to be allowed”.

Similarly, the public authorities have also failed to read the provisions of law in full. The following provisions to section 8(1) is as under:-

“---- Provided that the information which cannot be denied to the Parliament or the State Legislature shall not be denied to any person.”

8. The Legislature and Parliament are definitely within their legislative powers and authority to ask any question about the private practice, whether government has allowed it or not, whether there is an express ban on conducting such practice. The Commission is pained and shocked to find that the order of the PIO is absolutely silent on this issue. The Act has provided for a institution of FAA who is always a senior authority than the

PIO. The appellant had approached the FAA with the hope that the mandate of the Act will be upheld by the FAA. Under this Act, FAA as well as the PIO are quasi judicial authorities who have to implement the express legal provisions contained in the J&K State RTI Act, 2009, not in an executive and administrative manner, but absolutely in a quasi judicial practice. They should be conscious that their decision will be scrutinized by the Commission. They have to keep provisions of section 12, 13 and 15 of the Act in view. The FAA was expected to hear the appellant before adjudicating the appeal. The adjudication in law means to settle and decide an issue where more than one parties are involved. There is not an iota of submissions of the appellant considered by the FAA. The FAA has ignored the very concept of appeal which is that an appeal in law is a case from inferior or subordinate to superior tribunal or forum in order to test and scrutinize the correctness of the decision appealed against. It means that the FAA was to scrutinize the order of PIO and not act as a mere stamp without considering the objections of the appellant against the order of the PIO.

9. Now, the Commission would like to know what were the facts and circumstances prevailing in the Hon'ble Supreme Court's decision in the case of Girish R. Deshpande v/s CIC and others which were referred by the appellant and followed by the above authorities.

10. Before going through the facts of the case and distinguishing it from the facts and circumstances of the case under appeal, it would be relevant to know under what facts and circumstances courts have to adhere and follow a particular decision in a particular situation. The Hon'ble Supreme

Court in the case of Padma Sundra Rani V/s State of Tamil Nadu in 255 ITR147 has made the following observations :-

“Courts should not place reliance on decision without discussing as to how the factual situation of the decisions on which reliance is placed. There is always peril in treating the words of a speech or judgment as though they are words in a legislative enactment, and it is to be remembered that judicial utterances are made in setting of the facts of a particular case, said Lord Morris in *Herrington V/s British Railways Board* (1972) 2 WLR 537 (HL) circumstantial flexibility, one additional or different fact can make a world of difference between conclusions in two cases.”

In the case of *Girish R. Deshpande*, the only issue for the consideration before the Hon'ble Supreme Court was whether the information with regard to salary, promotion, transfer orders, copies of memo or show cause notices, censure etc, issued to a government employee for his non- performance and copies of assets and liabilities, investment and other related matters, gifts etc received by the person whose details was asked, details of moveable and immovable properties and copies of complete enquiry report and copy of show cause notices etc etc, were to be disclosed. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has rightly held that these informations are personal in nature, particularly details of assets and liabilities, gifts received. In this case, the Court also found that show cause notices issued to the officer, which were on account of his performance as an officer employed in an organization was a matter which is between the employee and the employer which are covered under service rules.

However, the Hon'ble Supreme Court made the following important observations:-

" Of course, in a given case, if the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer or the appellate authority is satisfied in the larger public interest justifies the disclosure of such information, appropriate orders could be passed."

11. The Commission has gone through the facts of this case and has found that these facts are totally at variance from the facts of the case which is under appeal before this Commission. In this case, the information sought is not regarding personal assets, investments or performance as employee but information is sought in respect of the violation of standard government orders banning the private practice. Nobody can deny the fact that private practice conducted by a doctor, who is on the role of the government, affects the hundreds and thousands of patients and is thus overwhelmingly in public interest. Public should know whether a particular doctor, who is a government employee is also attending his private practice. This is a vital information which is needed for a patient so that he/she can choose whether he will consult such doctor in government hospital, whether he is performing primary job and getting remuneration or consult a private doctor, who is exclusively giving attention to his patients at a private clinic. The patient must have such independence. Therefore, this cannot be treated as a personal information. Secondly, there is a plethora of evidence and justification put on the record by the information seeker showing how this information is in overwhelmingly public interest. As the Hon'ble Court, even in the case referred above has held that if an appellate authority finds a public interest, even information which is covered under section 8(1)(d)(e) & (i) can be disclosed.

12. With regard to information of action taken by the SKIMS administration after molestation charges with the female patient against the concerned doctor were proved by the enquiry committee, Commission has in detail in the foregoing paragraphs highlighted the nature of the information and its public importance. No sensible and sensitive person can pass an order stating that such information is a personal information pertaining to a doctor. A patient is in the noble care of a doctor. His life is a concern not only to his immediate family but to his/her friends and relatives and other concerned. The information on the act of "uncivilized behavior or molestation/sexual harassment allegations averted by the appellant", is overwhelmingly in public interest and has to be disclosed. Therefore, the Commission directs disclosure of information sought at 1(a). As regards 1(b) and 1(c), the Commission does not agree with the appellant that service records of said doctor be also provided to him. The Commission has taken a consistent stand in its earlier judgments that service book record is a matter between employee and the employer and hence cannot be disclosed under Right to Information Act. Similarly, APRs are also a matter between an employee and the employer and as no other overwhelming public interest has been made out by appellant, therefore, this information is not to be disclosed under the facts and circumstances of this case. However, the appellant is at liberty to move any competent court, if he feels that his right to promotion has been ignored and somebody who did not deserve promotion on the basis of his service record, has been promoted.

13. The Commission would now adjudicate the issue raised by the appellant in his RTI application at point 2 regarding outcome of the letter forwarded to the Competent Authority by SKIMS Administration recommending immediate suspension of the said Doctor and related information, attendance statement of the said doctor signed by the HOD of the month in which he was caught by Government indulging in private practice, report from the enquiry committee constituted in this behalf by the SKIMS administration, report from the Vigilance, Crime Department as indulging in private practice at SKIMS was a criminal act at that time. Considering the submission of the appellant which are quite convincing, the PIOs order and third party's objections in this regard, Commission does not agree with the PIO and FAA that information at point 2(a)(b)(c)(d) is not disclosable information. As highlighted in the foregoing paras, this information strictly falls under the definition of givable information and being in larger public interest, as defined under Section 2, r.w. Section 7 & 8. The disclosure of this information is amply justified, keeping in view proviso to Section 8, which states that information which can not be denied to the Parliament or State Legislature shall not be denied to any other person. The information sought by the appellant is definitely within competence of the Hon'ble Members of the Parliament and State Legislature to ask. The Commission has already in the above foregoing paras agreed with the contentions of the appellant that Section 8(2) warrants the disclosure of such information. Therefore, information sought at point 2(a-d) of the RTI application is givable and PIO is directed to disclose this information. At point 2(e), the appellant has also sought details of service benefits as Prof. Gastroenterology given to the said doctor after doing his criminal act of private practice. The appellant has

brought nothing before this Commission that disclosure of this information involves larger public interest, involving any criminal act, etc, which may/has affected/affected others also. The Commission being consistent with its orders that service matters being employee and employer issue, this information need not be disclosed. Similarly, information sought at point 3 of the RTI application dated: 29-12-2014 is also givable and should have normally been put in public domain, in view of the Section 4 of the J&K, RTI Act, 2009, so that the citizens need not to resort to filing of separate RTI applications. Therefore, Commission directs disclosure of this information by the PIO. The order of the Commission passed herein above be complied within 02 weeks from the receipt of this order.

14. Before concluding this order, Commission feels it necessary to make a few observations. " The uncivilized conduct with a lady patient " is a scar on the attributes of a civilized society. The respect and honour to be given to mothers, sisters and daughters i.e women folk has not only to be an article of faith but a day-to-day practice while living in a civilized and dignified society. The respect and honour to women is not only enshrined in religious scriptures, the secular laws and statutes are also not lagging behind. Almost all civilized world has ensured " fundamental rights to its citizens, gender equality is an integral part of these rights. It is not enough to say that right to life is secured. It should mean right to life with dignity and honour." The notorious case math of Nirbhaya Rape and Murder compelled the Government of India to appoint a committee under the chairmanship of late Justice Verma for recommending stringent measures for curbing sexual harassment that was characterized by the said committee as matters of serious concern. Not only because of the

physical, mental and psychological trauma which endanger the victim but were unfortunately tolerated by a society claiming “lofty ideals of dignified treatment to its women folk.” As the “right to be protected from sexual harassment and sexual assault is enshrined in the constitution on which very construct of gender status stands”, therefore, the “role of the government should not only and merely be reactive and apprehend and punish the culprits for their crime.” While sending these recommendations, the Justice Verma Committee had quoted the following observations of the National Human Rights Commission:-

“...it is the primary and inescapable responsibility of the State to protect the right to life, liberty, equality and dignity of all of those who constitute it. It is also the responsibility of the State to ensure that such rights are not violated either through overt acts, or through abetment or negligence. It is a clear and emerging principle of human rights jurisprudence that the State is responsible not only for the acts of its own agents, but also for the acts of non-state players acting within its jurisdiction. The State is, in addition responsible for any inaction that may cause or facilitate the violation of human rights”.

“The purpose of laws is to prescribe the standard of behaviour of the people and to regulate their conduct in a civilized society. Faithful implementation of the laws is of the essence under the rule of law for good governance. In the absence of faithful implementation of the laws by efficient machinery, the laws remain mere rhetoric and a dead letter”.

While hearing this appeal, the Commission was informed that the only action which the enquiry committee recommended against the sexual harassment in the hospital was to “censure and reprimand.” In the light of

stringent measures which the Justice Verma Committee suggested and most of which have been accepted by the government by bringing amendments in the Criminal Procedure Code and corresponding amendments in the J&K State Ranbir Penal Code, the mere censure and reprimand of the accused sounds not only death to human conscience but brings out the extreme insensitivity of the authorities towards our mothers, sisters and daughters. This type of culture of reprimand has rightly been summed up as under:-

“ The culture of petty reprimand within government is not about discipline, it is an acknowledgement of its inability to generate enthusiasm”.

15. The Commission would also once again reiterate that the only purpose and rationale of introducing right to information in the state of J&K is to bring transparency and accountability in the working of public authorities. The Commission would expect that this revolutionary and exalted right is used. only for this purpose and not for petty individual interests to defame others. The Commission would also hope and trust that the people who are responsible for running this premier medical institute i.e SKIMS would entirely serve the noble cause of preserving and protecting the human life who is described in our holy Quran as the superior creature. The prospectus and personal aggrandizement should not be the whole and sole aim of people who are running the hospitals and medical institutions. To curb any future harassment of women patients, the authorities of SKIMS and other hospitals, nursing homes and clinics & Polyclinics, etc should go through the recommendations of Justice Verma Committee report and Hon’ble Apex Court’s celebrated decision in the case

of Vishaka and ors v/s State of Rajasthan and ors on 30th August 1997 and take immediate corrective measures.

Sd/-
(G.R. Sufi)
(Chief Information Commissioner)

Sd/-
(Er. Nazir Ahmad)
State Information Commissioner

No. SIC/K/SA/37/2015-

Dated: -08-2015

Copy to the:-

- 1. Principal Secretary to Hon'ble Chief Minister, J&K, State for information and necessary action.**
- 2. Commissioner/Secretary to Government, General Administration Department, Civil Secretariat, J&K, Srinagar for information and necessary action.**
- 3. Commissioner/Secretary to Government, Health & Medical Education Department, Civil Secretariat, J&K, Srinagar for information.**
- 4. Director, SKIMS, Srinagar (Ex-officio, Secretary to the Government) for information.**
- 5. Mr. Riyaz Ahmad, Joint Director, SKIMS and Ex-Officio, Special Secretary to the Government, First Appellate Authority, SKIMS, Soura, Srinagar for information and necessary action.**
- 6. Rafiq Ahmad Dar, Sr. Administrative Officer-cum-Public Information Officer, SKIMS, Soura, Srinagar for information and necessary action.**
- 7. Pvt. Secretary to HCIC / Pvt. Secretary to HSIC, (K).**
- 8. Dr. G.N.Yattoo S/o Gh. Ahmad Yattoo R/o C-7, Lane-5, Friends Enclave, Humhama, Budgam (Appellant)**
- 9. Dr. Gul Javid, Dean Medical Faculty, Professor & Head, Department of Gastroenterology, SKIMS, Srinagar (3rd Party).**
- 10. Dr. Altaf Shah, Professor, Department of Gastroenterology, SKIMS, Srinagar (3rd Party).**
- 11. Guard File.**

(G.Q.Bhat),
Registrar,
J&K, State Information Commission.