

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

Appeal No. 6377 of 2025

Piyush Mastkar	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated February 08, 2025 (received by SEBI on March 10, 2025) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated March 20, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated April 15, 2025 (received by the Office of Appellate Authority on April 28, 2025). 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, in his application dated February 08, 2025, sought the following information regarding his complaint filed on SCORES portal:
 1. *the current status of his complaint with all the details thereof.*
 2. *details of actions taken on his complaint with all the relevant notes.*
 3. *certified copies of the documents submitted by Ms. Neha Gupta, Proprietor, Trade India Research in the concerned matter.*
 4. *copies of correspondence made with the applicant with regard to submission of facts, etc.*
 5. *certified copies of the documents mentioned in point no 4 above.*
 6. *Whether any action has been initiated in this matter by SEBI as well as other departments.?*

7. *How many applicants have been paid service fees and other fees with regard to complaint lodged against Ms. Neha Gupta, Proprietor, Trade India Research?*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to the queries, informed that the information sought has already been replied by CPIO, SEBI vide letter No. CPIO/GM/163/2024-25 dated May 16, 2024, in response to the RTI Application No. SEBIH/R/E/24/00458 dated April 19, 2024. The copy of the aforementioned letter was also enclosed by the respondent in his reply.
4. **Ground of appeal**- On perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response provided by the respondent.
5. I have perused the queries and the response provided thereto. On perusal of the materials available on record, I note that identical requests have been made by the applicant in his earlier RTI application (Reg. No. SEBIH/R/E/24/00458) dated April 19, 2024, for which the respondent had already provided the reply vide his letter (ref. CPIO/GM/163/2024-25) dated May 16, 2024. Further, FAA order dated July 11, 2024 was also passed with respect to the said earlier RTI application in Appeal no. 6046 of 2024. Hence, I find that the said requests are repetitive in nature.
6. In the context of filing repetitive requests under RTI Act, the Hon'ble Central Information Commission (hereinafter referred to as "**CIC**") in the matter of *Dinesh Kumar Kesarwani v. PIO, Allahabad Museum* (CIC/ALDMU/A/2017/102135; Date of decision: 24.04.2017), held that "*Though Right to Information Act, 2005 did not have any specific provision to bar the re-petition for information like Section 11 of Code of Civil Procedure, the universal principle of civil justice 'res judicata' will certainly apply and the repeated requests can be denied. ... Engaging with the application which is same or slightly modified request for information which was responded earlier will be certainly against the principles of natural justice – both procedural and substantive, as far as right to information is concerned.*"
7. Further, Hon'ble CIC in the matter of *Shri Ramesh Chand Jain vs. Delhi Transport Corporation, GNCTD, Delhi* (File No. CIC/AD/A/2013/001326–SA decided on June 25, 2014) held: "*Thus, once information is given, applicant shall not seek the same once again in the guise of different form or language. If the applicant seeks information again and again, the PIO, the First Appellate Authority and the Commission would be forced to spend their time on this repeated application, and in the process the authorities would lose that much time to address the other RTI applications or performing their general duties in their public office. Repeated RTI applications will amount to clogging the office of public authority and CPIO would be justified in refusing the same with intimation of reasons. Because the repeated RTI application has an effect of clogging the public offices, it would amount to obstructing the free*

flow of information to deserving and genuine RTI applicants, besides preventing the officers from performing their general duties attached to their office". Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.

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: May 23, 2025

RUCHI CHOJER

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