

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

**Appeal No. 6966 of 2026**

Sarju Devi : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application dated June 02, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated June 25, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated July 08, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00250). 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 02, 2026 sought the following information:

*“Sir/Madam,*

*Kindly provide the following information under the RTI Act, 2005 in relation to CPGRAMS Appeal No. SEBI/E/A/26/0000177 and the underlying SCORES proceedings concerning Security 1035UCL26 (ISIN: INE583D07448):*

- 1. Certified copies of all file notings, internal notes, examination sheets, comments, recommendations, approvals and observations recorded by SEBI officials while processing and disposing the grievance.*
- 2. Certified copies of all correspondence exchanged between SEBI and NSE relating to the grievance.*
- 3. Certified copies of all correspondence exchanged between SEBI and Upstox relating to the grievance.*

4. *Certified copies of any records, notes, examination reports or observations relating to the screenshots submitted by the complainant showing Face Value of Rs 1000 displayed on NSE interfaces despite prior principal redemptions.*

5. *Certified copies of any records, notes or observations relating to the allegation that different NSE interfaces displayed different Face Values for the same security.*

6. *Certified copies of records showing whether the grievance regarding exchange-displayed Face Value and dissemination inconsistency was independently examined by SEBI and, if so, the findings recorded.*

7. *Certified copies of records, notes, comments or observations relating to the compensation proposal of Rs 2,08,650.60 and subsequent settlement discussions referred to in the complaint documents.*

8. *Certified copies of records showing the basis on which the grievance and appeal were disposed.*

9. *Name, designation and department of all SEBI officials who examined, reviewed, approved or disposed the grievance and appeal.*

10. *Certified copy of the complete complaint processing history, including internal forwarding, departmental routing, comments and approvals, if maintained.”*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to query nos. 1 to 8 and 10 in the application, informed that the complaints referred is CPGRAMS complaints and the information pertaining to the same may be sought from CPGRAMS.

With regard to query no. 9, the respondent informed that the information sought relates to personal information and may cause unwarranted invasion and may endanger the life or physical safety of the person(s). The same is, therefore, exempt in terms of section 8(1)(j) and 8(1)(g) of the RTI Act.

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. With regard to query nos. 1 to 8 and 10 in the application, I find that the queries have not been adequately addressed.
6. With regard to query no. 9, I find that the information about SEBI officials relates to personal information, the disclosure of which has no relationships to any public activity or interest and may cause unwarranted invasion into the privacy of the individual and may also endanger the life or physical safety to the person. I

note that a similar issue was settled in the matter of *H. E. Rajashekarappa vs. State Public Information Officer and Ors.* (Order dated July 01, 2008), wherein the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka had ruled that: "... it cannot be said that section 2(f) of the Act (the RTI Act encompasses the personal information of the officials of the public authority. The intention of the legislation is to provide right to information to a citizen pertaining to public affairs of the public authority". Further, I note that the Hon'ble Central Information Commission (hereinafter referred to as "CIC"), in the matter of *Prerit Misra vs. CPIO, SEBI* (order dated November 21, 2022) held that- "It is pertinent to mention here that the appellant in a similar case which was dealt in File no. CIC/SEBIE/A/2019/660770 dated 10.08.2021 whereby he had sought information regarding the names of the officers who had blocked his email address, the Commission, while passing an order had held that such information is exempted u/s 8(1)(g) & 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act. The Commission after considering the submissions of the appellant finds no merit in his case, and also is in agreement with the order of the FAA and concludes that the information is exempt u/s 8(1)(g) & 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, hence, no relief can be given." In view of these observations, I find that the requested information is exempt from disclosure under sections 8(1)(g) and 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act.

7. Considering the above observations, I remit query nos. 1 to 8 and 10 in the application to the respondent for *de novo* consideration of application and sending appropriate response to the appellant in terms of RTI Act, within 15 working days from the date of receipt of this order.
8. The Appeal is accordingly disposed of.

Place: Mumbai

Date: August 05, 2026

**RUCHI CHOJER**

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