

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

Appeal No. 6868 of 2026

Sanjay Kumar : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated April 06, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated May 05, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated May 05, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00166). 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. The appellant has filed the appeal only against the response of the respondent to query nos. 2 to 8 in the application.
3. **Query nos. 2 to 8 in the application** - The appellant, in his application dated April 06, 2026, sought the following information:

“I had filed a complaint and subsequent appeal before SEBI regarding alleged illegal fund mobilisation by Babubala Private Limited. The details are Appeal No SEBII E A 26 0000078 and PMOPG Grievance No PMOPG E 2026 0029270 dated 19 02 2026. Further it is submitted that I have also sent emails to SEBI on 28 02 2026 to sebi@sebi.gov.in complaints@sebi.gov.in surendrag@sebi.gov.in and on 17 03 2026 to uec-ero@sebi.gov.in . In this regard I seek the following information strictly as per Section 2(f) of RTI Act 2005 i e records documents file notings and correspondence available on record.

2 Copies of file notings movement sheets and internal correspondence regarding examination of my complaint and appeal.

3 Copies of any letters notices or communications issued by SEBI to Babubala Private Limited and replies received if any.

4 Copies of any inquiry report inspection report or verification report available on record.

5 Copies of any communication between SEBI and PMO or any other authority regarding my complaint.

6 Record showing present status of my appeal file including remarks or noting entries.

7 Copies of any order note or document showing disposal or rejection of my complaint or appeal.

8 Names and designations of officials as available in records who processed my complaint and appeal...”

4. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to query nos. 2 to 7 in the application, informed that the information sought pertains to the internal functioning of SEBI and is strategic in nature, disclosure of which may hamper the decision-making by SEBI in its supervisory and regulatory role. In view of the above, the information sought is exempted u/s 8(1)(a) of the RTI Act.

The respondent, in response to query no. 8 in the application, informed that the information sought relates to personal information, the disclosure of which may also endanger the life or physical safety of the person(s). Therefore, respondent stated that the information sought is exempted under section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act.

5. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was refused access to the information requested.
6. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. With regard to query no.2, I concur with the response of the respondent that the requested information pertains to the internal functioning of SEBI and is strategic in nature, disclosure of which may hamper the decision-making by SEBI in its supervisory and regulatory role. In this context, I note that in *ICAI v. Shaunak H. Satya*, [(2011) 8 SCC 781], the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that: -*"The competent authorities under the RTI Act will have to maintain a proper balance so that while achieving transparency, the demand for information does not reach unmanageable proportions affecting other public interests, which include efficient operation of public authorities and the Government, preservation of confidentiality of sensitive information and optimum use of limited fiscal resources."* Hence, I find that the requested information falls within the exemption under section 8(1)(a) of the RTI Act. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
7. Considering facts and circumstances of the present matter, I find that the query nos. 3, 4 and 5 have not been adequately addressed. The respondent is directed to ascertain the availability of requested information

- with respect to query nos. 3, 4 and 5 and whether the same can be provided to the appellant in accordance with the provisions of the RTI Act.
8. With regard to query nos. 6 and 7, I find that the respondent has not invoked sufficient justification for invocation of section 8(1)(a) of RTI Act for denial of the information. Accordingly, I find that the aforementioned queries warrants reconsideration.
 9. With regard to query no. 8, I find 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.
 10. Considering the above observations, I remit the application to the respondent for *de novo* consideration of query nos. 3 to 7 in the application and sending appropriate response to appellant in terms of RTI Act, within 30 days from the date of receipt of this Order.
 11. The appeal is accordingly disposed of.

Place: Mumbai

Date: June 03, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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