

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

Appeal Nos. 6436 & 6437 of 2025

Nitin Goradia : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant filed two applications dated May 26, 2025 under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent by a common letter dated June 17, 2025 responded to the appellant. The appellant filed two appeals (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00135 and Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00136) dated June 17, 2025 against the said response. Since the information sought in the applications, the responses thereto and the grounds of appeal are similar, these appeals are taken up together for consideration and disposal. I have carefully considered the applications, the responses and the appeals and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record.
2. **Queries in the appellant’s applications –**

Application No.	Information sought
SEBIH/R/E/25/00647	How to file formal corruption case against Ms. XXXX XXX of MIRSD-SEC6 in SEBI ?
SEBIH/R/E/25/00648	How to file formal corruption case against Ms. XXXXX XXXX who is a DGM in SEBI ?

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to queries in the applications, informed that information for lodging complaint against employees of SEBI is available on SEBI website.

4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was refused access to information requested.
5. I have perused the applications and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I note that the respondent has informed that the appellant can access the requested information from the SEBI website. Thus, I note that requested information is available on public domain. In this context, I note that the Hon'ble Delhi High Court, in the matter of *Registrar of Companies & Ors. Vs. Dharmendra Kumar Garg & Anr.* and the Hon'ble Central Information Commission in the matter of *Shri K Lall vs. Shri M K Bagri* (CIC/AT/A/2007/00112, order dated April 12, 2007), *inter alia*, observed that if the relevant information is available in the public domain, the same cannot be said to be information held by the public authority and consequently, there is no obligation to provide such information to an applicant under the RTI Act. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
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: July 09, 2025

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