

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

**Appeal No. 6676 of 2026**

Mukesh Kumar Chaudhary : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application dated December 04, 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 30, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00344) dated December 31, 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 December 04, 2025, sought the following information:

*“I had submitted complaints to SEBI via email addressed to the SEBI Chairman regarding alleged unethical practices by Mutual Fund Distributors MFDs and have also submitted a police complaint related to the matter. The details of my complaint submitted to SEBI are as follows: Name of MFDs involved as per my complaint: Pankaj Laddha and Anant Laddha Mode of submission: Email to SEBI Chairman Police complaint report: Already sent to SEBI via email Email dates \_25JULY2025 AND 24SEP2025 Kindly provide the following information:*

1. *Whether SEBI has received my complaints emails and documents sent by me regarding the above matter.*
2. *Copies of all internal notes file notings and action taken by SEBI on my complaints.*
3. *Status of examination inquiry or investigation if any initiated based on my complaint.*
4. *Name designation and official contact details of the SEBI Officer handling my complaint.*

5. *Copies of any communications sent by SEBI to AMFI or Mutual Funds or Intermediaries regarding my complaint.*
6. *Certified copy of any order report or closure note if the complaint has been disposed of.*
7. *Details of whether the matter has been forwarded to any other department or regulatory body.*
8. *Current status and file tracking number relating to my complaint in SEBI system.”*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to queries in the application, informed the Mutual Fund Distributors (**MFDs**) are registered with Association of Mutual Funds in India (**AMFI**) and complaints related to MFDs are dealt by AMFI. Accordingly, the received complaints were referred to AMFI for necessary action. The respondent also enclosed along with his reply, copies of the communications from SEBI to AMFI in this regard.

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 note that the appellant in his application has sought information on his complaint filed with SEBI including the status and action taken. In this regard, I note that the respondent has informed that the complaint was forwarded to AMFI as the complaints related to MFDs were dealt by AMFI. In light of the aforesaid, I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the application by providing the information available with him.

6. Additionally, it is noted that appeal is also in the nature of request for redressal of grievance. I note that redressal of grievance does not come under the purview of the RTI Act. In this context, I note that the Hon’ble Central Information Commission, in the matter of *Mr. Surendra Vishwakarma vs. President Secretariat* (Order dated April 29, 2016) observed that “*In this context, we note that the RTI Act cannot be used to make the respondent to do certain things or take certain action for the reason that the Act is not the proper law for redressal of grievances/ disputes and there are other appropriate forum(s) for resolving such matters.*” Further, appellant, in his appeal, has challenged the quality of action taken by SEBI. In this regard, reference is drawn to the decision of Hon’ble CIC in *Dr. D. V. Rao vs Shri Yashwant Singh & Anr.* (Order dated April 21, 2006), wherein it was held that “It is not open to an appellant to ask, in the guise of seeking information, questions to the public authorities about the nature and quality of their actions.” Accordingly, I find that no further intervention of this forum is necessary.

7. 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 21, 2026**

**RUCHI CHOJER**

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