

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

Appeal No. 5738 of 2023; Appeal No. 5739 of 2023; Appeal No. 5740 of 2023;
Appeal No. 5741 of 2023; Appeal No. 5742 of 2023

Harbans Singh Sahni	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed three applications (Reg. No. SEBIH/R/E/23/00563 dated June 11, 2023; Reg. No. SEBIH/R/E/23/00597 dated June 19, 2023 and Reg. No. SEBIH/R/E/23/00632 dated June 28, 2023 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a common letter dated July 05, 2023, responded to the applications filed by the appellant. The appellant filed five appeals (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/23/00150; Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/23/00151; Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/23/00152 and Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/23/00153 dated July 12, 2023 and Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/23/00160 dated July 13, 2023) against the said response dated July 05, 2023. I have carefully considered the applications, the response and the appeals and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record.
2. **Queries in the applications–** The appellant, vide his applications, *inter alia*, sought information regarding the subject matter pertaining to allotment of shares of VR Mathur Mass communication (now known as Gradiente Infotainment Ltd.).
3. The respondent, in response to the aforesaid applications, observed that the appellant’s matter was heard by the Hon’ble CIC ten times and orders were passed on various dates during the period from June 04, 2020 to November 10, 2022. June 04, 2020; December 21, 2020; December 23, 2021; September 05, 2022 and September 13, 2022. Further, the appellant’s third application filed before the Hon’ble CIC was disposed of on December 23, 2021, *inter alia*, with the observation that the CPIO is not obliged to provide clarification/confirmations to the applicant with respect to redressal of his grievances. It was also observed that filing multiple RTI applications pertaining to similar issues will not entitle him to receive the requested information. Further, the Hon’ble CIC, advised and restrained the appellant from filing repeated RTI applications with respect to the similar issues in future. Similarly, the respondent

referred to the other orders passed by the Hon'ble CIC in similar matters, wherein the appellant was, *inter alia*, advised to approach appropriate forum to redress his grievances. Accordingly, the respondent advised the appellant to restrain from filing repeated RTI applications with respect to similar issues on the subject matter in future and approach appropriate forum to redress his grievance.

4. **Grounds of appeal-** The appellant filed the appeal on the ground that access to the requested information was refused.
5. I have considered the applications and the response. I find that the requests are more in the nature of repeated enquiry with respect to the subject matter which is in the nature of grievance. I note that the appellant has been advised multiple times to approach the appropriate court of law with respect to the subject matter of the applications. Further, I note that the Hon'ble CIC, vide a recent order dated November 10, 2022 passed in matter of *Harbans Singh Sabni vs, CPIO, SEBI*, observed as under:
"From a perusal of the relevant case records and taking note of the detailed written submissions filed by the CPIO, it is noted that the appellant is in the habit of filing multiple RTI applications and all are meant to seek redressal of his personal grievances related to ownership of some shares. One of such matter was already heard and decided by the same bench on 01.11.2022 vide File No. CIC/SEBIH/A/2021/615241. The CPIO has again brought it to the notice of the Commission that the appellant had filed almost 132 RTI applications from 2018 to 2021, and 79 first appeals. He has also informed that 07 second appeals filed by the same appellant regarding similar issues had already been adjudicated by the Commission wherein the appellant was advised to approach an appropriate forum for redressal of his grievance. The Commission does not find any flaw in the reply given and rather than filing unnecessary RTI applications, the appellant is once again advised to pursue his grievance before the appropriate forum rather than filing similar RTI applications which are devoid of any merit."
6. In view of the above observations, I find that no interference is warranted at this stage. The appeals are accordingly dismissed.

Place: Mumbai

Date: August 10, 2023

ANAND BAIWAR

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