

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

**Appeal Nos. 6555, 6557 & 6578 of 2025**

Syed Abdul Rahman : Appellant  
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed similar applications dated August 14, 2025 (Reg. No. SEBIH/R/E/25/01076), August 16, 2025 (SEBIH/R/E/25/01069) & September 16, 2025 ((Reg. No. SEBIH/R/E/25/01195) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent by letters dated September 11, 12 & 26, 2025, responded to the applications filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00241) dated September 11, 2025, an appeal (bearing Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00243) dated September 13, 2025 and appeal (bearing Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00260) dated September 26, 2025 against the aforementioned response.
2. I note that present applications are similar to and on the same subject matter as that in the appellant’s application dated August 16, 2025 (bearing Reg. No. SEBIH/R/E/25/01078) filed with SEBI. Further, FAA Order dated October 09, 2025, upholding the reply of the respondent, has also been passed with respect to the appeal filed against the response of the respondent to the aforementioned application. Hence, I find the instant applications to be repetitive in nature. In the context of filing repetitive requests 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 “*The universal principles of civil justice also recognized ‘constructive res judicata’, which in the RTI context means when an applicant uses an opportunity of obtaining information on a particular subject as per law, he is expected to seek all the related information in that first ever opportunity itself. He cannot file another application for a bit or piece which he forgot to ask, or not advised by his lawyer, or for any other reason. He should ask all possible aspects of information about that subject matter, in the first ever available opportunity. Even if he does not, it is presumed by law that he asked for that and was refused after due trial..... 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.

3. The appeals are accordingly dismissed.

**Place: Mumbai**

**Date: October 09, 2025**

**RUCHI CHOJER**

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