

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

Appeal No. 6643 of 2025

Shashank Dubey : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated October 21, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated November 19, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00316) dated November 29, 2025. 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 October 21, 2025, sought the following information:

“1. Certified copy of the acknowledgement or internal receipt note confirming receipt of my Vedanta Scam Report via email on 21.04.2025.

2. Details of the officer or division assigned by SEBI for examination or investigation of my complaint.

3. Certified copies of file notings, internal correspondence, inter divisional communications, and minutes of meetings held in relation to my complaint and Vedanta Scam Report.

4. Certified copies of any letters, notices, or communications issued by SEBI to Vedanta Limited, its subsidiaries, or its auditors seeking clarification or information.

5. Whether SEBI has referred or shared my complaint and evidence with SFIO, Enforcement Directorate, CBI, Ministry of Corporate Affairs, or Income Tax Department for coordinated investigation. If yes, provide certified copies of forwarding notes or communications.

6. Current status of the complaint including whether any investigation, inspection, or enforcement proceedings have been initiated.

7. *Certified copy of the Action Taken Report ATR or any progress report, note sheet, or internal summary prepared by SEBI or CFID Division in connection with my complaint.*
8. *Whether SEBI has submitted any report or feedback to CEIB or Ministry of Finance regarding the outcome of examination or action taken on my complaint. If yes, provide certified copies of such reports.*
9. *Present status of the file whether it is under examination, closed, or transferred to any other authority.*
10. *Name, designation, and contact details email or phone of the officer currently handling the file related to my complaint.”*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to query no.1 in the application, informed that SEBI is in receipt of the appellant’s email dated 21.04.2025.

The respondent, in response to query nos. 2 and 10, informed that the information sought relates to personal information, the disclosure of which would cause an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the individual and hence exempt under Section 8(1) (j) of the RTI Act.

The respondent, in response to query nos. 3 to 9, informed that SEBI conducts examinations and investigations confidentially in a holistic manner and if found necessary, further action will be taken. In view of the same, disclosure of details related to the matter may impede the process and is therefore exempt from disclosure in terms of Section 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act. However, post investigation, whenever violations are established, appropriate enforcement actions are taken under the provisions of the SEBI Act, 1992 and Regulations framed thereunder which culminate in the issuance of Orders. These Orders are available in public domain and can be accessed from SEBI website.

4. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. With regard to query no.1, I note that the respondent has adequately addressed the query by providing the information available with him.
5. With regard to query nos. 2 and 10, I find that the information sought about SEBI official(s) relates to personal information, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest and may cause unwarranted invasion into the privacy of the individual and may also endanger the life or physical safety to the person. In this regard, I note that the Hon’ble Central Information Commission (**CIC**) in the matter of *Prerit Misra vs. CPIO, SEBI* (order dated November 21, 2022) held that- “*It is pertinent to mention here that the appellant in a similar case which was dealt in File no. CIC/SEBIE/A/2019/660770 dated 10.08.2021 whereby he had sought information regarding the names of the officers who had blocked his email address, the Commission, while passing an order had held that such information is exempted u/s 8(1)(g) & 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act. The Commission after considering the submissions of the appellant finds no merit in his case, and also is in agreement with the order of the*

FAA and concludes that the information is exempt u/s 8(1)(g) & 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, hence, no relief can be given."

In view of these observations, I find that the requested information is exempt from disclosure under sections 8(1)(g) and 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act.

6. With regard to query nos. 3 to 9, I note that maintaining confidentiality of examination/ investigation is important since reports of the same may result in unwarranted speculation or concern in the market or may affect evidence collection during the examination/investigation or may result in unnecessary harm to third parties. Hence, I find that the requested information is exempt under Section 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act. In this context, reliance is placed on the decision of Hon'ble Central CIC in *Manju Devi v CPIO, SEBI* (Order dated April 29, 2025), wherein Hon'ble CIC while deciding on a case with similar facts and circumstances as that of the present one, had upheld the denial of information under Section 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act. Further, I note that information regarding any regulatory action taken by SEBI/penalty imposed against entities, will be available on the website of SEBI. The rationale for neither confirming nor denying existence of any examination/investigation was relied upon by SEBI before the Hon'ble CIC in *Arun Damodar Savant vs CPIO, SEBI* (order dated September 26, 2018 in Appeal No. CIC/SEBIH/A/2017/ 137139/BJ). The Hon'ble CIC, in the said matter, accepted the submissions and refused to intervene in the response of the CPIO. Similar observations were also made by the Hon'ble CIC, in the matter of *Anju Sharma vs. CPIO, SEBI* (order dated September 28, 2020). In view of these observations, 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: December 23, 2025

RUCHI CHOJER

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