

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

**Appeal No. 6760 of 2026**

Raj Yadav : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application dated January 22, 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 16, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00075) dated February 18, 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 22, 2026, sought the following:

*“I seek the following information under Section 6(1) of the RTI Act 2005. The information sought is limited to certified copies of complaints and related disposal records maintained by SEBI in the ordinary course of its regulatory and grievance redressal functions under Section 4(1)(a) of the RTI Act 2005.*

*The applicant does not seek investigation material, evidence, inquiry reports, or internal deliberations. The request is confined to copies of complaints, acknowledgements, and final disposal records.*

*Time period: 01.01.2025 to 31.12.2025*

1. *Provide certified copies of all complaints, representations, or grievance petitions received by SEBI during the above period in which Brookfield Asset Management or any Brookfield group entity is named or referred. Personal identifiers of complainants may be redacted.*

2. *Provide certified copies of the diary entries, acknowledgement letters, or electronic intake records generated by SEBI on receipt of the complaints mentioned in point 1.*
3. *Provide certified copies of final action taken reports, closure letters, orders, or disposal notes issued by SEBI in respect of the complaints mentioned in point 1.*
4. *Where any complaint mentioned in point 1 was forwarded to another authority or handled through any internal SEBI division, provide certified copies of the forwarding letters and the final disposal or closure communication on record.*
5. *Provide a certified consolidated list or index for the above period showing complaint diary number, date of receipt, broad subject category, and disposal status for each complaint mentioned in point 1.*

*If any part of the information sought is treated as third party information, kindly follow the procedure under Section 11 of the RTI Act 2005. Any refusal of information may kindly cite the specific exemption under Section 8 of the RTI Act along with reasons, as required under Section 7(8).*

*It is submitted that disclosure of copies of complaints and their disposal records cannot be denied solely on the ground of pendency unless it is demonstrated how such disclosure would impede investigation. The information sought relates to records mandatorily maintained under Section 4(1)(a) of the RTI Act 2005.*

*If any part of the information is held by another public authority, kindly transfer the application under Section 6(3) of the RTI Act and inform the applicant.*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –With respect to Brookfield India Real Estate Trust, the respondent has informed that the copies of the complaints are available to SEBI in a fiduciary capacity and include commercial confidential information, the disclosure of which could harm the competitive position of the entities. The information sought is exempt u/s 8(1)(d) & 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act.

Further, the respondent informed that Brookfield Asset Management is not registered with SEBI as an AIF. Further, the respondent informed that no complaint has been received against Brookfield Asset Management by SEBI, including in SCORES, during the period from 01/01/2025 till 31/12/2025, and hence, no information is available with SEBI.

The respondent also informed that Brookfield Asset Management ULC is an FPI registered with SEBI under registration number INCAFP079924, and SEBI has not received any complaints against this FPI during the aforementioned period.

Further, with respect to complaints against the Brookfield group entity, the respondent informed that the information sought is not available with the SEBI.

4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was refused access to the information requested.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. I note that the appellant, in his appeal and his application, has sought details of complaints filed with respect to “*Brookfield Asset Management or any Brookfield group entity*”. I note that respondent has clearly informed Brookfield Asset Management is not registered with SEBI as AIF. Notwithstanding the aforesaid, the respondent had informed that an entity “Brookfield Asset Management ULC” is registered with SEBI as a FPI. Further, respondent has informed that no complaints have been received by SEBI against Brookfield Asset Management and Brookfield Asset Management ULC. In light of the aforesaid, I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the query by providing the information available with him.
6. Additionally, I am of the view that the term “any Brookfield group entity” as used in the application is vague and not specific. It is an established law that the information sought for in order to be disclosable under the RTI Act, must be clear, specific and available in the records of the public authority. In this context, I note that in the matter of *Mr. T. V. Sundaresan vs. CPIO, Securities and Exchange Board of India* (Decision dated November 24, 2021), the Hon’ble Central Information Commission (hereinafter referred to as “**CIC**”) held: “*The framework of the RTI Act, 2005 expects that the information sought is specific and believed to be existing with the public authority in documented or material form as such; which can be shared with the appellant as per the provisions of the RTI Act. Answering to broad, multiple and general queries and presumptive documents that should have been generated as per the expectation of the appellant cannot be furnished under the provisions of the Act.*” Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
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: March 16, 2026**

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