

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

Appeal No. 6419 of 2025

Debasish Bandopadhyay : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated May 07, 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/25/00121) dated June 04, 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. **Query in the application** - The appellant, in his application dated May 07, 2025, sought the following information:

“I had sent a letter dated 10.09.2024 to The Regional Director, Eastern Regional Office, Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) at Kolkata by speedpost, communicating my complaints against EIH Limited as a shareholder of the company. The speedpost having consignment number EW102025348IN was delivered to addressee on 17.09.2024. Since then I have not heard anything from SEBI. I am hereby seeking information about the status of my said complaints which relate to multiple violations of LODR Regulations of SEBI committed by the company. The covering letter sent to SEBI ERO is attached herewith.”

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to query in the application, informed that the complaint was uploaded on SCORES portal, reference No. SEBIP/WB24/SOUT/032858/1 on September 27, 2024. The respondent also informed that the closure of the aforementioned complaint was

informed to the appellant vide letter dated November 4, 2024. The respondent also enclosed a copy of the aforementioned letter with his reply.

4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was provided incomplete, misleading or false information. The appellant has submitted that he is unable to view his complaint on SCORES. The appellant has contended that incorrect information was furnished by the respondent.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I note that respondent has informed the appellant that his complaint was uploaded on SCORES. The respondent also informed that closure of the complaint was communicated to the appellant vide letter dated November 4, 2024. Thus, I find that the respondent has clearly informed the appellant regarding the status of his complaint.
6. Further, on perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is questioning the correctness/veracity of the information provided by the respondent. In this context, it is observed that the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in *Hansi Rawat & Anr. vs Punjab National Bank & Ors.* (LPA No. 785/2012-decision dated January 11, 2013) held that “.....*the proceedings under the RTI Act cannot be converted into proceedings for adjudication of disputes as to the correctness of the information furnished.*” Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
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 02, 2025

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