

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

Appeal No. 6786 of 2026

Arani Guha

: Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai

: Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated January 26, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated February 10, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00092) dated February 27, 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 26, 2026, sought the following information:

“REFERRING TO THE STOCK BROKER DESIGNATED ANGEL ONE REGISTERED WITH YOU AS, STOCK BROKER../

. 2. KINDLY INFORM THE NUMBER AND NATURE OF CASE/COMPLAINTS FILED AGAINST THE BROKER WITH YOU FROM THE PUBLIC AND INSTITUTIONAL ENTITIES IN THE YEAR 1998 TO THE DATE ON THIS INFORMATION REQUEST AS ADMISSIBLE AS PER RTI ACT. 2005. EXEMPTING AY PREVIOUSLY SEND AS PER RTI ACT. 2005.

3. KINDLY INFORM COMPLAINT/CASES FILED BY THE BROKER WITH YOU IN THE AFOREMENTIONED DURATIONS IN FROM YEAR 1998 TO THE DATE OF THIS APPLICATION 26-01-2026 EXEMPTING ANY PREVIOUSLY SENT AS PER R.T.I ACT 2005 TO THE ADDRESS AND APPLICANT.

4. KINDLY INFORM ON THE MEASURES TAKEN FORM THE BOARD TO INTEGRATE DAY TRADING WITH REFERENCE TO INDIVIDUAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ENTITIES WITH THE NATIONAL/DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN EXCHANGES AND THE REGULATORY LIMITS ON SAME TRADE IMPOSED ON INDIVIDUAL AND INSTITUTIONS AS APPLICABLE AS PER RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT 2005.

AS ON TODAY THERE IS NO STOCK BROKING ONLINE PLATFORM FUNCTIONING FROM THE TERRITORIES OF UNION OF INDIA PROVIDING ACCESS TO FOREIGN EXCHANGE AND GLOBAL COMMODITY, FIRE ARMS AND WEAPON, WEAPON PLATFORM TRADE DIRECTLY. THE PRESENT DAY TRADING PLATFORMS PROVIDE LINK TO STOCK BROKER REGISTERED AND LOCATED ABROAD FOR THE SAME FUNCTION. THE SAME WAY HAS A FUNCTIONAL AND ENFORCEMENT EFFECT BECAUSE OF TIME ZONE COMMUNICATION LAG. AND LEGAL DIFFERENCE AMONGST TERRITORIAL JURISDICTIONS.

5. KINDLY INFORM ON THE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES WORKING WITH THE BROKER MENTIONED EARLIER AS ANGEL ONE PRIVATE LIMITED INDIA AND OTHERS AS IN THE NAME RANK AND DESIGNATION ALONGWITH COMMUNICATION INFORMATION OF THE OFFICERS AND OFFICIALS IF ANY EXEMPTING ANY PREVIOUSLY SENT.”

3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to the application, informed that appellant can refer to the letter of CPIO, SEBI, with reference no. CPIO/BS/1472/2025-26 dated December 12, 2025, which was enclosed by him along with the application.
4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has not mentioned any specific ground for filing the appeal.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I note that the appellant had sought similar information vide his previous application (Ref No. SEBIH/R/E/25/01482) dated November 16, 2025. The respondent had provided his response to the previous application vide letter (Ref. no. CPIO/BS/1472/2025-26) dated December 12, 2025. Hence, I find the appellant’s application to be repetitive in nature. In the context of filing repetitive applications under RTI Act, the Hon’ble Central Information Commission in the matter of *Shri Ramesh Chand Jain vs. Delhi Transport Corporation, GNCTD, Delhi* (File No. CIC/AD/A/2013/001326–SA decided on June 25, 2014) held that “..... Thus, once information is given, applicant shall not seek the same once again in the guise of different form or language. If the applicant seeks information again and again, the PIO, the First Appellate Authority and the Commission would be forced to spend their time on this

repeated application, and in the process the authorities would lose that much time to address the other RTI applications or performing their general duties in their public office. Repeated RTI applications will amount to clogging the office of public authority and CPIO would be justified in refusing the same with intimation of reasons. Because the repeated RTI application has an effect of clogging the public offices, it would amount to obstructing the free flow of information to deserving and genuine RTI applicants, besides preventing the officers from performing their general duties attached to their office’. In view of the above, I find that no further intervention of this forum 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 24, 2026

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