

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

Appeal Nos. 6291 & 6292 of 2025

Harbans Singh Sahni	:	Appellant
Vs		
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated November 26, 2024 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated December 03, 2024, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed two identical appeals (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00012) and (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00013) both dated January 13, 2025 with respect to the aforesaid RTI application.
2. I note that under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, an aggrieved person may prefer the first appeal within thirty days from the receipt of the response from the CPIO of the concerned public authority. In the instant case, the impugned response from the respondent is dated December 03, 2024. The appellant, therefore, should have filed the first appeal on or before expiry of thirty days from the date of receipt of the said response. As noted above, the appellant’s first appeals were received on January 13, 2025. The first appeal has been made after the last date permissible under the RTI Act. The appellant neither made a request for condoning the said delay in filing the appeal nor made any submission explaining the reasons which caused the delay. The RTI Act specifies a clear timeline within which appeals must be filed to ensure prompt and efficient redressal of information requested.
3. Notwithstanding the above observations, I have considered the appeal on merit. I have carefully considered the application, the response and the appeals and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record.

4. **Query in the application** - The appellant, in his application dated November 26, 2024, sought the following information:

“In past it has a record complaint launched multiple of Complaint launched kindly provide the action taken by sebi Regarding the company Gradiante infotainment ltd Involving RTA changed the shareholder Record from S Harban Singh to Mohammad Abdul Muqueet but no Report has been submitted under Right to information Act and which has a record in Sebi”

5. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to query in the application, informed that appellant's query is vague and not specific. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as "information", as defined u/s 2(f) of the RTI Act.

The respondent also informed that the appellant's matter was heard by the Hon'ble Central Information Commission (hereinafter referred to as “**CIC**”) ten times and orders were passed on various dates during the period from June 04, 2020 to November 10, 2022. Further, the appellant's third application filed before the Hon'ble CIC was disposed of on December 23, 2021, *inter alia*, with the observation that the CPIO is not obliged to provide clarification/confirmations to the applicant with respect to redressal of his grievances. It was also observed that filing multiple RTI applications pertaining to similar issues will not entitle him to receive the requested information. Further, the Hon'ble CIC, advised and restrained the appellant from filing repeated RTI applications with respect to the similar issues in future. Similarly, the respondent referred to the other orders passed by the Hon'ble CIC in similar matters, wherein the appellant was, *inter alia*, advised to approach appropriate forum to redress his grievances. Accordingly, the respondent advised the appellant to restrain from filing repeated RTI applications with respect to similar issues on the subject matter in future and approach appropriate forum to redress his grievance.

6. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I concur with the response of the respondent that the appellant query is vague and not specific. It is an established law that the information sought for in order to be disclosable under the RTI Act, must be clear, specific and available in the records of the public authority. In this context, I note that in the matter of *Mr. T. V. Sundaresan vs. CPIO, Securities and Exchange Board of India* (Decision dated November 24, 2021), the Hon'ble CIC held: *“The framework of the RTI Act, 2005 expects that the information sought is specific and believed to be existing with the public authority in documented or material form as such; which can be shared with the appellant as per the provisions of the RTI Act. Answering to broad, multiple and general queries and presumptive documents that should have been generated*

as per the expectation of the appellant cannot be furnished under the provisions of the Act.” Therefore, the said query cannot be construed as seeking ‘information’ as defined under section 2(f) of the RTI Act.

7. Further, I find that the appellant’s queries are more in the nature of repeated enquiry with respect to the subject matter which is in the nature of grievance. I note that the appellant has been advised multiple times to approach the appropriate court of law with respect to the subject matter of his applications. In this regard, I note that the Hon’ble CIC in the matter of *Harbans Singh Sahni vs. CPIO, SEBI* (order dated September 09, 2024) observed that *“The Commission after adverting to the facts and circumstances of the case, hearing both parties and perusal of records, observes that the appellant filed repeated and multiple RTI application based on the similar subject matter which is in the nature of grievance and purely against the spirit of the RTI Act. 2005. Further, the Commission has through various orders advised and restrained him from filing repeated and similar RTI applications in future..... Further, the findings of the Commission in the instant set of matters largely point towards a misuse of the RTI Act being perpetuated by the Appellant.”* Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response.
8. In view of the above observations, I find that there is no need to interfere with the decision of the respondent. The appeals are accordingly dismissed.

Place: Mumbai

Date: February 10, 2025

RUCHI CHOJER

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