

Ajay Basudev Bose	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

1. The appellant had filed an application dated March 11, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated March 20, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated March 20, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00115). 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. **Queries in the application-** The appellant, vide his application, sought the following information:

In this regard, please provide the following information specifically with respect to Moongipa Investment Limited and its directors:

- Page 1 of 4

4. Provide copies of investigation reports, action taken reports, or correspondence between the Ministry of Finance, Directorate of Enforcement, SEBI, SFIO, or any other government agency concerning Moongipa Investment Limited.

5. Whether any complaints, intelligence inputs, or references regarding financial irregularities, cheating of investors, or corporate fraud by Moongipa Investment Limited have been received by the Department of Revenue, ED, or any law enforcement agency

.- If yes, provide the action taken report.

- If no investigation or enforcement action has been taken against Moongipa Investment Limited, kindly provide the reasons recorded on file for not initiating proceedings under PMLA or any other applicable law.

6. Provide copies of file notings, internal correspondence, and decision-making records of officers in the Ministry of Finance or Directorate of Enforcement regarding Moongipa Investment Limited.

7. Whether the case of Moongipa Investment Limited was ever referred to or examined by the Serious Fraud Investigation Office (SFIO). If yes, provide details and copies of reports.

8. Whether any reference or complaint regarding Moongipa Investment Limited was forwarded by SEBI or any other regulatory authority to ED or Department of Revenue. If yes, provide copies of such references and the action taken.

9. Provide the names and designations of officers responsible for examining complaints or references related to Moongipa Investment Limited and the”

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to query no. 1 in the application, informed that SEBI conducts examinations and investigations confidentially in a holistic manner to examine alleged or suspected violations of laws and regulations related to securities market and if found necessary, further action is taken. Further, respondent stated that as disclosure of details related to the matter may impede the process of investigation or apprehension or prosecution of offenders, the same is exempt from disclosure in terms of Section 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act. The respondent also stated that 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.

Further, respondent informed that no reference was made to ED as per the information available on the record.

The respondent, in response to query nos. 2, 3, 5 and 6, informed that the information sought does not pertain to SEBI.

The respondent, in response to query no. 4, informed that no such correspondence as mentioned in the application is available on record.

The respondent, in response to query no. 7, informed no such reference as mentioned in the application is available on record.

The respondent, in response to query no. 8, informed that as per information available on record, no such reference or complaint was forwarded by SEBI.

The respondent, in response to query no. 9, informed that the information sought relates to personal information, the disclosure of which may endanger the life or physical safety of the person(s). hence the same is exempt under Sections 8(1)(g) & 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act.

4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was provided incomplete, misleading or false information.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. With regard to query nos. 1, 4, 7 and 8, I note that the respondent has adequately addressed the queries by providing the information available with him.
6. With regard to query nos. 2, 3, 5 and 6, the respondent has clearly informed that the information sought does not pertain to SEBI. Hence, I find that the requested information is not available with the respondent. I note that the respondent can only provide information that is available in the records. In this context, I note that the Hon'ble Central Information Commission (hereinafter referred to as "**CIC**") in the matter of *Sh. Pattipati Rama Murthy vs. CPIO, SEBI* (Decision dated July 8, 2013), held: "... if it (SEBI) does not have any such information in its possession, the CPIO cannot obviously invent one for the benefit of the Appellant. There is simply no information to be given." Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
7. With regard to query no. 9, I find that the information about SEBI officials relates to personal information, the disclosure of which has no relationships 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. I note that a similar issue was settled in the matter of *H. E. Rajashekarappa vs. State Public Information Officer and Ors.* (Order dated July 01, 2008), wherein the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka had ruled that: "... it cannot

*be said that section 2(f) of the Act (the RTI Act encompasses the personal information of the officials of the public authority. The intention of the legislation is to provide right to information to a citizen pertaining to public affairs of the public authority". Further, I note that the Hon'ble 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.

8. 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: April 16, 2026

MANINDER CHEEMA
LINK APPELLATE AUTHORITY UNDER THE RTI ACT
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA