

Plantations Limited before the Hon'ble MPID Court, Mumbai with Case No. 16 of 2005. SEBI has filed a Miscellaneous Application before the Hon'ble MPID Court, stating that since the Hon'ble Court is seized of the matter, therefore, SEBI shall not proceed independently and would only assist the Hon'ble Court as and when directed.

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. Vide query no.1, the appellant had sought the action taken by SEBI on a complaint dated 09.07.2018. On consideration, I note that the respondent has clearly informed that the information sought does not pertain to appellant. Hence, I find that the information sought by the appellant pertains to a third party. In this context, I note that in the matter of *Chandrakant Kantilal Patel vs. CPIO, SEBI* (order dated December 27, 2022), wherein copies of complaints filed against Aakruti Nirmiti Ltd were sought, the Hon'ble Central Information Commission has held as under:

“Firstly, the RTI application clearly reveals that the information sought is related to a third party as defined u/s 2(n) of the RTI Act. Sec 2 (n) states that “third party” means a person other than the citizen making a request for information and includes a public authority. ...Therefore, the complainants who filed complaints against Aakruti Nirmiti Limited (ANL), and the SEBI all are third parties in this case.....SEBI, being a public authority, can make public so much of the information that it is authorized in terms of their rules and when the parties involved are third parties, the denial of the same u/s 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act appears to be completely justified. The appellant cannot insist on getting the information sought by taking the aid of the RTI Act when clearly he was not the complainant in this case.”.

Thus, I find that the information sought is exempt under section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent. Notwithstanding the aforesaid, the respondent has informed that information about any enforcement action taken by SEBI is available on SEBI website. The appellant may be guided by the same.

6. With regard to query no. 2, I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the query by providing the information available with him. 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 20, 2026

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