

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

Appeal No. 6537 of 2025

Babu Henry : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated August 01, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated August 26, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00229) dated August 26, 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. **Queries in the application** - The appellant, in his application dated August 01, 2025, sought the following information:

“The attached is the intimation sent by Prime Ministers Office (PMO) on 17/ /03/2025, regarding the public grievance number PMOPG/D/2025/0050507.

With respect to the same, kindly answer the following questions under RTI Act 2005.

- 1) What is the expected date of redressal for PMOPG/D/2025/0050507?*
- 2) The grievance was supposed to be addressed within 45 days of date of reception. Why did not it happen?*

N: B

- 1) I intend to submit this RTI request as well as the reply received to the Mumbai Special ACB court.*
- 2) OPINIONS are classified as information under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act of 2005. As such SEBI cannot reject my request, as did in the past, even if you feel that the questions are asking opinions.”*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to query nos. 1 and 2 in the application, informed that the complaint (Ref. No. PMOPG/D/2025/0050507) has been redressed within 45 days of its receipt by SEBI. The respondent also informed that in the aforementioned PMOPG complaint, appellant had referred to a SCORES complaint (SEBIE/MH21/0012780/1) and alleged that the same was not handled properly by SEBI officials. The instant SCORES complaint was regarding non-updation of study materials for certain NCFM modules by NSE. It is submitted that the aforesaid SCORES complaint was redressed on November 29, 2021 and necessary clarification was provided to the complainant.

The respondent informed that the aforementioned complaint was a repeat of the same allegations levelled in the aforesaid SCORES complaint, and that the appellant did not provide any fresh information substantiating his allegations.

4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was provided incomplete, misleading or false information. The appellant, in his appeal, has contended that his complaint has not been resolved as on the date of filing the appeal. The appellant, in his appeal, has requested the instant forum to direct the respondent to provide the requested information. The appellant has also requested the instant forum to impose penalty on the respondent under section 20 of the RTI Act.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. I note that the appellant, in his appeal, has challenged the correctness of the response provided by the respondent. On consideration, I find that correctness of the information provided cannot be decided in the instant proceedings. In this context, it is pertinent to note that Hon'ble Delhi High Court in *Narendra Tyagi vs Assistant Director (CPIO)* [LPA 764/2023], dated 06.12.2023, has held as under: “13. Consequently, it is clear that dispute as regards the correctness of information provided under the RTI Act, or any other dispute or controversy, cannot be adjudicated in proceedings under the RTI Act. The CPIO is only required to supply all the information/documents within his access. Whether or not such information as provided by the CPIO under the RTI Act is incorrect in any manner, is not the domain of consideration or determination under the RTI proceedings.” In light of the aforesaid, I find that no further interference of this forum is necessary.

6. 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: September 24, 2025

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