

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

Appeal No. 6960 of 2026

Gobi Krishnan : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated June 06, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated July 03, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated July 05, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00244). 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 June 06, 2026 sought the following information:

“1.I would like to know the information about the actions taken on the petition submitted to the SEBI chairman through e-mail dated 09/05/26 (complaint copy attached,pg1).

2.I would like to know the information about the actions taken on the petition submitted to the SEBI chairman through e-mail dated 26/05/26 (complaint copy attached,pg2).

3.I would like to know the information about the actions taken on the petition submitted to the SEBI chairman through e-mail dated 23/05/26(complaint copy attached,pg3).”
3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to the query nos. 1 and 2 in the application, informed that the emails were forwarded to the concerned departments.

With regard to the query no. 3, the respondent informed that the email was forwarded to the concerned department and the matter was closed.

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. On consideration, I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the queries by providing the information available with him. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
6. The appellant, in his appeal, has contended that he requires proof for validating the information provided by the respondent. In this regard, I note that the appellant in his application had not specifically sought for any documentary records. As held by the Hon'ble Central Information Commission in *Harish Prasad Divedi vs. Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited* (decided on January 28, 2014), an information seeker cannot be allowed to expand the scope of his RTI enquiry at appeal stage. Further, appellant may note that factual merits of the information provided by the CPIO cannot be called into question within the confines of the RTI Act. In this context, I find it pertinent to note that Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the matter of *Hansi Rawat and Anr. v. Punjab National Bank and Ors.* (LPA No.785/2012) dated 11.01.2013 has held “6.proceedings under the RTI Act cannot be converted into proceedings for adjudication of disputes as to the correctness of the information furnished.” Accordingly, I find that the said submission does not warrant consideration at this stage.
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: July 31, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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