

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

Appeal No. 6749 of 2026

Badri Prasad Singh	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”), which was transferred to the respondent from Department of Economic Affairs on December 12, 2025. The respondent, by a letter dated January 09, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated February 02, 2026 (received by the Office of Appellate Authority on 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, has stated that he had invested ₹21,000 in Naka Solutions after being misled by a fraudulent mobile advertisement featuring the Union Finance Minister, Smt. Nirmala Sitharaman. The appellant has further mentioned that this amount grew substantially over the period of time. The appellant narrated that a financial adviser from the company contacted him, demanding an additional ₹1,20,000 as a prerequisite for processing the refund. Although the appellant requested the advisor to deduct the said amount from his funds and remit the remaining amount but the adviser has ceased all communication and refused to return the promised amount. The appellant has requested the authority to take action against the said company and to arrange for refund.
3. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the information sought is in the nature of grievance. The respondent further informed that resolution of

grievance does not come under the provisions of RTI Act. 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.

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 concur with the response of the respondent that request of the appellant is in the nature of grievance/complaint. 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