

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

Appeal No.6848 of 2026

Sanjeev Kumar Dixit : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated March 22, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated April 16, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated April 23, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00150). I have perused the application, the response of the respondent and the appeal and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record.
2. The appellant has filed appeal only against the response of the respondent to query no. 2 in the application.
3. **Queries in the application** - The appellant, in his application dated March 22, 2026, sought the following information:

“ 1. Please provide the names of your offices inspected by the Parliamentary Committee on Official Languages from January 1, 2025, to the present date.

2. Please provide the name, total quantity, details of expenditure incurred on the items supplied as tokens to the Hon'ble Committee by the inspected offices under item No. 1 above, office-wise, and photocopies of the relevant bills, expenditure vouchers/notes.”
4. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to query no.2, informed that the information sought pertains to internal functioning of SEBI. Hence, respondent informed that the same is exempt under section 8(1)(a) of the RTI Act.

5. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was provided incomplete, misleading or false information.
6. I have perused the query and the response provided thereto. note that the respondent has categorically informed the appellant that the information sought is exempt u/s 8(1)(a) of RTI Act, 2005. I agree with the response of the respondent that the requested information pertains to internal functioning of SEBI and relates to systems and procedure followed by SEBI, which is strategic in nature. I find that the disclosure of the requested information would affect and compromise the regulatory and supervisory role of SEBI. The same may also hamper decision making by SEBI. In this context, I note that in *ICAI v. Shaumak H. Satya*, [(2011) 8 SCC 781], the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that: - "*The competent authorities under the RTI Act will have to maintain a proper balance so that while achieving transparency, the demand for information does not reach unmanageable proportions affecting other public interests, which include efficient operation of public authorities and the Government, preservation of confidentiality of sensitive information and optimum use of limited fiscal resources.*" 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: May 21, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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