

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

Appeal No. 5591 of 2023

Rajeev Khanna	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated December 30, 2022 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated January 27, 2023 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/23/00026) dated January 30, 2023. 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, vide his application dated December 30, 2022, sought following information-

“An Appeal in the name of the SEBI chairman dated 1.11.2022 has been sent to SEBI Mumbai. yet there is no reply so far. You are requested to advise the decision taken on the Appeal(Enclosed).”
3. The respondent, in response to the aforesaid query, informed that the letter dated November 01, 2022 was being considered as a complaint against the company and its RTA and the same has been uploaded on SCORES portal. The respondent also informed that the complaint was forwarded to the company and the RTA for re-examination and that the matter was under examination. Further, the respondent provided two SCORES complaint numbers and advised the appellant to access the current status by logging in the SCORES portal. The respondent also provided the link for accessing the FAQs on ‘Investor Grievances- SCORES’.
4. **Ground of appeal-** The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that the information provided was incomplete, misleading or false. The appellant, in his appeal, *inter alia*, submitted that the information

furnished was perverse and cryptic and that there is no application of mind. The appellant further stated that the appeal should have been decided by the Chairman or the Full Time Member.

5. I have perused the query and the response provided thereto. I note that the appellant had categorically sought information regarding action taken on his appeal/letter dated November 01, 2022. On consideration, I find that the respondent has provided the information available on record. In my opinion, the query has been adequately addressed. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response.
6. Further, the appellant has made various submissions in his appeal. On consideration, I find that the said submissions of the appellant are in the nature of grievance. I note that the Hon'ble CIC, in the matter of *Sb. Triveni Prasad Babuguna vs. LIC of India, Lucknow* (Decision dated September 6, 2012), held: "*The Appellant is informed that ... redressal of grievance does not fall within the ambit of the RTI Act rather it is up to the Appellant to approach the correct grievance redressal forum...*". I note that a similar view was taken by the Hon'ble CIC in the matter of *Yogesh Malhotra vs. PIO, Delhi Police* (order dated May 28, 2021). In view of these observations, I am of the opinion that if the appellant has any grievance, the remedy for the same would not lie under the provisions of the RTI Act. Accordingly, the said submissions do not warrant consideration at this stage.
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

A SUNIL KUMAR

Date: February 23, 2023

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