

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

Appeal No. 6739 of 2026

Jameskutty Joseph : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated November 18, 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 09, 2025 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00059) dated February 09, 2026.
2. I note that under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, an aggrieved person may prefer the first appeal within thirty days from the receipt of the response from the CPIO of the concerned public authority. In the instant case, the impugned response from the respondent is dated December 09, 2025. The appellant, therefore, should have filed the first appeal on or before expiry of thirty days from the date of receipt of the said response. As noted above, the appellant’s first appeal was received on February 09, 2026. The first appeal has been made after the last date permissible under the RTI Act. The appellant neither made a request for condoning the said delay in filing the appeal nor made any submission explaining the reasons which caused the delay. Considering the absence of a request for condoning the delay and any valid reason that prevented the appellant from filing the appeal in time, I consider this appeal as time barred and hence, liable to be dismissed on that count.
3. Notwithstanding the above observation, I am considering the appeal on merit. I have perused the application and the appeal and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record.

4. **Queries in the application** - The appellant, in his application dated November 18, 2025, sought the following:

- “ 1. Provide certified copies of all Action Taken Reports ATR submitted by KFIN Technologies Pvt Ltd to SEBI or BSE in relation to complaint SEBIE KL25 ALAP 040961*
- 2. Provide certified copies of all supporting documents submitted by KFIN Technologies including but not limited to dispatch proof, tracking receipts, postal acknowledgement due AD cards, dispatch logs, register entries or returned envelopes for Share Certificate No 2041631.*
- 3. Provide certified copies of all correspondence exchanged between SEBI and KFIN Technologies in relation to this complaint including emails, notices, queries, reminders and clarifications.*
- 4. Provide certified copies of all correspondence exchanged between SEBI and BSE in relation to this complaint including forwarding letters, queries and reports.*
- 5. Provide certified copies of all file notings, internal examination comments, observations, recommendations and decision notes made by SEBI officers or departments handling this complaint at Level 1 and Level 2 review.*
- 6. Provide copies of any documents or explanations submitted by KFIN Technologies regarding their claim that the 2015 tracking details are unavailable after 90 days.*
- 7. Provide copies of any documents or explanations submitted by KFIN Technologies regarding the specific admission that the share certificate was not returned by postal authority.*
- 8. Provide certified copies of any communication received by SEBI regarding the involvement of KFIN employee Mr Bojimon Kunnel Haridas and whether SEBI sought clarification on this matter.*
- 9. Provide the current status of second level review, including whether SEBI has issued any show cause notice or additional query to KFIN.*
- 10. Provide the reasons, if any, recorded by SEBI for not issuing a direction to reissue duplicate share certificates without insisting on investor indemnity, given that the loss occurred before delivery”*

5. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to query nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 in the application, informed that the action taken report submitted by KFIN Technologies Pvt. Ltd. in relation to the complaint is part of the action history in SCORES. The respondent informed that the appellant can view the entire action history and ATR by logging in to SCORES website by using his credentials. The respondent also mentioned that ATRs have been uploaded by KFIN Technologies and BSE on SCORES platform itself and as the disposal of complaints is through online mode only, certified copies are not provided by SEBI.

Further, respondent informed that as the complaint handling process is online no other documents (viz. dispatch copy, tracking report etc.) are available with SEBI. The ATR includes all correspondences/ clarification and noting and no separate noting/observation is available.

The respondent, in response to query nos. 6, 7, 8 and 10, informed that no such information is available with SEBI.

The respondent, in response to query no. 9, informed that second level review is pending with SEBI. The respondent has also informed that ATR was submitted by Designated Body (BSE) on 14.11.2025.

6. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was provided incomplete, misleading or false information.
7. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. With regard to query nos. 1, 2,3 4 and 5, I note that the respondent has informed that all actions, observations, clarifications sought and responses received are recorded as part of the action history on SCORES, which is accessible to the appellant after logging in with the credentials on SCORES. Accordingly, I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the queries by providing the information available with him.
8. Further, with regard to query nos. 6, 7, 8 and 10, I note that the respondent has categorically informed that the requested information is not available with SEBI. I note that the respondent can only provide information that is available in the records. In this context, I note that the Hon'ble Central Information Commission (hereinafter referred to as "**CIC**") in the matter of *Sh. Pattipati Rama Murthy vs. CPIO, SEBI* (Decision dated July 8, 2013), held: "... *if it (SEBI) does not have any such information in its possession, the CPIO cannot obviously invent one for the benefit of the Appellant. There is simply no information to be given.*" Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
9. With regard to query no. 9, I note that the respondent has provided the information available with him. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.

10. 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: March 05, 2026

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