

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

Appeal No. 6435 of 2025

Najiya : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated May 15, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated June 02, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00134) dated June 16, 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 her application dated May 15, 2025, sought the following information:

1. एन.एस.ई. के ब्रोकर के खिलाफ कोर्ट में सिविल वाद और आपराधिक मामले होने के बावजूद एन. एस.ई. ने आज तक ब्रोकर के खिलाफ उचित कार्यवाही नहीं की।
2. एन.एस.ई. कई ऐसे ब्रोकर आचार संहिता का उल्लंघन करके आम पार्टनर/ए.पी. को गुमराह करके उनके साथ विश्वासघात किया जा रहा है।
3. Suspension & Expulsion को एन.एस.ई. सही ढंग कार्यवाही नहीं कर रही है।
4. हम ब्रोकर के खिलाफ कोर्ट के मामले को SEBI को बताना चाहते हैं। इसलिए हमें बताएं कोर्ट के मामले को SEBI के किस विभाग को भेजे, उनका नाम, पता, ईमेल और सम्पर्क सूत्र बताये?

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to query nos. 1 to 3 in the application, informed that no information was sought by the appellant.

The respondent, in response to query no. 4, provided information regarding lodging of grievance, if any, on the SCORES portal of SEBI and tracking the status of the same. The respondent also informed that appellant can also lodge complaint on the Market Intelligence portal and that such information provided is treated as confidential market intelligence and not as a complaint on SCORES.

4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that she was provided incomplete, misleading or false information.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. On consideration, with respect to query nos. 1 to 3, I concur with the respondent that no information was sought by the appellant. With respect to query no. 4, I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the query by providing the information available with him. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
6. 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: July 09, 2025

RUCHI CHOJER

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