

BEFORE THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(Under the Right to Information Act, 2005)
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA

Appeal No. 6979 of 2026

Jagadish : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”), which was transferred by Central Vigilance Commission to SEBI on November 04, 2025. The respondent, by a letter dated December 02, 2025 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated July 14, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/P/26/0044, received by Office of Appellate Authority vide email dated July 14, 2026).
2. I note that under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, an aggrieved person may prefer the first appeal within thirty days from the receipt of the response from the CPIO of the concerned public authority. In the instant case, the impugned response from the respondent is dated December 02, 2025. The appellant, therefore, should have filed the first appeal on or before expiry of thirty days from the date of receipt of the said response. As noted above, the appellant’s first appeal was received on July 14, 2026. The first appeal has been made after the last date permissible under the RTI Act. The appellant neither made a request for condoning the said delay in filing the appeal nor made any submission explaining the reasons which caused the delay. Considering the absence of a request for condoning the delay and any valid reason that prevented the appellant from filing the appeal in time, I consider this appeal as time barred and hence, liable to be dismissed on that count.
3. Notwithstanding the above observation, I am considering the appeal on merit. I have perused the application and the appeal and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record.
4. **Queries in the application** - The appellant, in his application, sought the following information:

“12091/2023 also 5 more complaints only silence please update status as SEBI has false fully auctioned unconnected property also quietly posted settlement orders for 66L without mentioning 50 Crores property auctioned unlawfully”

5. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the Complaint number 12091/2023 and other CVC Portal complaints received in Vigilance Department, SEBI were examined and closed, as no vigilance angle was seen in the matter.
6. **Ground of appeal** – On perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response of the respondent.
7. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the query by providing the information available with him. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
8. I also note that appellant in his appeal has challenged the correctness of the response to his application. It is pertinent to note that the Hon’ble High Court of Delhi in *Narendra Tyagi vs. Assistant Director (CPIO)* (Decision dated December 06, 2023) has held: *“it is clear that dispute as regards the correctness of information provided under the RTI Act, or any other dispute or controversy, cannot be adjudicated in proceedings under the RTI Act. The CPIO is only required to supply all the information/ documents within his access. Whether or not such information as provided by the CPIO under the RTI Act is incorrect in any manner, is not the domain of consideration or determination under the RTI proceedings.”* In view of the aforesaid observation, I find that the said submission of the appellant does not warrant consideration at this stage.
9. I also note that similar queries were also raised by the appellant in his previous applications bearing No. SEBIH/R/X/24/00005 dated March 07, 2024 and SEBIH/R/X/24/00089 dated August 27, 2024, to which respondent had informed vide his letters dated March 22, 2024 and September 06, 2024, about the closure of the complaints. Hence, I also find the appellant’s application to be repetitive in nature.

10. In view of the above observations, I find that there is no need to interfere with the decision of the respondent.
The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Place: Mumbai
Date: August 12, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER
APPELLATE AUTHORITY UNDER THE RTI ACT
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA