

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

**Appeal No. 6747 of 2026**

Ajay Basudev Bose : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application dated January 18, 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 an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00065) dated February 10, 2026. 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 January 18, 2026 sought the following:

*“Under RTI act please provide information related to Defaulter Sudhir Agarwal PAN AAFPxxxxx Refrence: GSTIN / UIN : 19AAFP1xxxxx Legal Name of Business: Sudhir Agarwal Trade Name: S A Enterprises After committing Fraud with Investors in Share Market Mr Sudhir Agarwal has Created / Used a bogus firm in Kolkata to Route and Launder funds through Illegal means , In view of the aforesaid facts it is kindly requested to SEBI*

*1)It is requested to SEBI to handover investigation to CBI ED to verify the GST Registration details of the said firm floated by Sudhir Agarwal,The registered address used for GST and all linked Bank accounts, Benificiaries and Transaction trials to ascertain Layering / Round Tripping and end use of Funds, Will the SEBI hand over the investigation to ED / CBI ,if so when?*

*2)It is further submitted that Ramesh Agarwal parental uncle of Sudhir Agarwal resides, / Operates from Kolkata and may have falicitated the above activities mentioned in point no 1 in view of the aforesaid facts will SEBI investigate of Associate/ Relatives in relation to the alleged scam of Fund Routing and related financial transactions after due verification*

*Please provide above sought information as Sudhir Agarwal has cheated Lakhs of Depositors and formed dubious company in Kolkata to divert the proceeds of scam money”*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to queries in the application, informed that the information is in the nature of grievance. The respondent stated that taking action or resolution of grievance does not come under the provisions of RTI Act and therefore, it does not qualify as information under provisions of section 2(f) of RTI Act. Further, the respondent provided information regarding lodging of grievance, if any, on the SCORES portal and tracking the status of the same. The respondent also provided the toll free helpline numbers launched by SEBI to facilitate replies to various queries of the general public on matters related to securities market. Additionally, the appellant was advised to refer to the FAQs on “Investor Grievances- SCORES”, available on the SEBI website and was also provided the link for accessing the same.
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. On consideration, I concur with the response of the respondent that request of the appellant is in the nature of seeking action/ 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.”* In view of the same, I find that the application has been adequately addressed and no further intervention is warranted at this stage.
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: March 05, 2026**

**RUCHI CHOJER**

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