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

Appeal No. 6975 of 2026

RM Nagappan	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated June 01, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 ("**RTI Act**"). The respondent, by a letter dated June 30, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated July 15, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00256). I have perused the application, the response of the respondent and the appeal and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record.

2. **Queries in the application** - The appellant, in his application dated June 01, 2026 sought the following information:

" I, RM Nagappan, respectfully request the following information:

1. The exact date on which my second request / review / appeal was received by SEBI relating to my original complaint.

2. The current status of the above second request / review / appeal.

3. Detailed reasons for the delay in disposal of the second request / review / appeal, which has been pending for more than 50 days as on date.

4. Name and designation of the officers responsible for processing the said second request / review / appeal.

5. Copies of all internal notes, file notings, or decisions taken on the above second request / review / appeal till date.

Reference Details: Original SCORES Complaint Registration No.: SEBIE/TN26/TIRU/012360/1 CPGRAMS Appeal No.: DCOYA/E/A/26/0001009 (arising from Grievance Ref. DCOYA/E/2026/0002345)"

3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to query no. 1 in the application, informed that the SCORES Complaint Registration No.: SEBIE/TN26/TIRU/012360/1 was assigned for second level review to SEBI on 06.04.2026. The respondent also stated that CPGRAMS Appeal No.: DCOYA/E/A/26/0001009 (arising from Grievance Ref. DCOYA/E/2026/0002345) have not been received by and processed by SEBI. Further, respondent informed that CPGRAMS Appeal No. SEBII/E/A/26/0000142 is under examination as on date and once suitable response has been received the same can be accessed by the appellant from CPGRAMS portal.

   With regard to query nos. 2, 4 & 5, the respondent informed that the SCORES Complaints and each details including the response provided is available and visible to the Complainant himself. The complainant can view the complaint history by logging to SCORES Platform using his credentials.

   With regard to name and designation of officers pertaining to handling of appeals, the respondent informed that the complaint handling mechanism at SEBI is a collective affair, in which officers of different levels contribute. Hence, handling the complaints is internal to the functioning of SEBI and the said information relates to personal information. Hence, the same is exempt u/s 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act.

   With regard to query no. 3, the respondent informed that the information sought is in the nature of seeking clarification. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as "information" as defined under section 2(f) of RTI Act.

4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was provided incomplete, misleading or false information.

5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. With regard to query no.1, I note that the respondent has adequately addressed the query by providing the information available with him.

6. With regard to query nos. 2, 4 and 5, I note that the requested information can be accessed by the appellant from SCORES portal.

7. Further, with regard to the name and designation of SEBI official, I note that the information about SEBI officials relates to personal information, the disclosure of which has no relationships to any public activity or

interest and may cause unwarranted invasion into the privacy of the individual and may also endanger the life or physical safety to the person. I note that a similar issue was settled in the matter of *H. E. Rajashekarappa vs. State Public Information Officer and Ors.* (Order dated July 01, 2008), wherein the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka had ruled that: "... *it cannot be said that section 2(f) of the Act (the RTI Act encompasses the personal information of the officials of the public authority. The intention of the legislation is to provide right to information to a citizen pertaining to public affairs of the public authority*". Further, I note that the Hon'ble Central Information Commission (hereinafter referred to as "**CIC**"), in the matter of *Prerit Misra vs. CPIO, SEBI (order dated November 21, 2022*) held that- "*It is pertinent to mention here that the appellant in a similar case which was dealt in File no. CIC/SEBIE/A/2019/660770 dated 10.08.2021 whereby he had sought information regarding the names of the officers who had blocked his email address, the Commission, while passing an order had held that such information is exempted u/s 8(1)(g) & 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act. The Commission after considering the submissions of the appellant finds no merit in his case, and also is in agreement with the order of the FAA and concludes that the information is exempt u/s 8(1)(g) & 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, hence, no relief can be given*." In view of these observations, I find that the requested information is exempt from disclosure under sections 8(1)(g) and 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act.

8. With regard to query no.3, I note that the query is in the nature of seeking reason/justification for the action/non action of SEBI from the respondent. On the context of seeking reasons for certain action/non action of public authority, the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay in *Dr. Celsa Pinto, Ex-Officio Joint Secretary (School Education) vs. the Goa State Information Commission* (Judgment dated on 3 April, 2008) held that "*The Public Information Authorities cannot expect to communicate to the citizen the reason why a certain thing was done or not done in the sense of a justification because the citizen makes a requisition about information. Justifications are matter within the domain of adjudicating authorities and cannot properly be classified as information*." Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.

9. 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 11, 2026

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