

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

Appeal Nos. 6724, 6725, 6726, 6727 & 6728 of 2026

Harbans Singh Sahni : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated January 06, 2026 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated February 04, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed five identical appeals (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00045, Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00046, Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00047, Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00048 and Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00049) dated February 04, 2026 against the said response.
2. **Query in the application** - The appellant, in his application dated January 06, 2026, sought the following:

“Complainant Number SEBIE/ AP18/0000043/1 in Conjunction with its RTA SEBIE /DH18/0000143/1 with reference to 3000 Bonus Shares complaint Kindly provide steps taken by sebi from 2018 with reference to entitlement of 3000 Bonus Shares which was Declared by company Gradiente infotainment ltd on 10 June 2011”
3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to the query in the application, informed that the appellant’s query has been answered multiple times. The respondent informed that appellant can refer to SEBI’s letter no. SEBI/NRO/OW/MIRSD/SKS/DL/1884/2018 dated October 04, 2018 and to his previous replies. The respondent has also informed that the Hon’ble Central Information Commission (**CIC**) in its various orders had advised and restrained the appellant from filling repeated RTI Applications with reference to similar issues in future.

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. I find that the appellant’s query is in the nature of repeated enquiry with respect to the subject matter which is in the nature of grievance. I note that the appellant has been advised multiple times to approach the appropriate court of law with respect to the subject matter of the application. In this regard, I note that the Hon’ble CIC in the matter of *Harbans Singh Sabni vs. CPIO, SEBI* (order dated September 09, 2024) observed that “The Commission after adverting to the facts and circumstances of the case, hearing both parties and perusal of records, observes that the appellant filed repeated and multiple RTI application based on the similar subject matter which is in the nature of grievance and purely against the spirit of the RTI Act 2005. Further, the Commission has through various orders advised and restrained him from filing repeated and similar RTI applications in future.....Further, the findings of the Commission in the instant set of matters largely point towards a misuse of the RTI Act being perpetuated by the Appellant.”
6. In view of the above observations, I find that no interference is warranted at this stage. The appeals are accordingly dismissed.

Place: Mumbai
Date: February 26, 2026

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