

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

Appeal No. 6655 of 2026

Payyappilly Mamachan : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated November 17, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated December 08, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00326) dated December 12, 2025. I have carefully considered the application, the response 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 November 17, 2025, sought the following information:

“I had submitted a detailed representation dated 18 October 2025, addressed to the SEBI Chairman, and copied to the Legal Affairs Department, through Registered Post. The matter concerns serious violations of SEBI rules by a registered broker. A copy of this letter is attached with this RTI application. To date, I have not received any reply or update from SEBI regarding this submission. Under Section 6(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, I request the following information:

1. *Whether SEBI has received my representation dated 18 October 2025.*
2. *The diary number / inward registration number allotted to this letter.*
3. *The department / officer to whom the representation has been forwarded.*
4. *The current status of my representation.*
5. *Details of action taken so far, including file movement details, internal notes, or correspondence.*
6. *Whether any response, clarification, or decision has been prepared or proposed regarding my letter.*
7. *The expected time frame within which a formal written reply will be issued to me.”*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to query nos. 1 to 7 the application, informed that SEBI is in receipt of application letter dated October 18, 2025. The diary number / inward registration number is 5943.

Further, the respondent informed that appellant's representation is under process and had not reached a logical conclusion and dealing with such matters at SEBI is a collective affair, in which officers of different level contribute. Hence, the same is internal to the functioning of SEBI.

4. **Ground of appeal** – On perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response of the respondent.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I note that respondent has adequately addressed the query nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, by providing the information available to him. Additionally, I note that the name of officer (s) sought by the appellant vide query no. 3, is in the nature of personal information. I find that a similar issue was settled by the Hon'ble CIC in the matter of *Shri V. Raj vs. Dr. G. Narayana Raju* (Decision dated August 22, 2007), wherein it had ruled that: "... a public servant contributing to a decision is entitled to his anonymity". In *H. E. Rajashekarappa vs. State Public Information Officer and Ors.*, 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 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.

6. 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: January 09, 2026

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