

Nikhil Shankar Girm : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

1. The appellant had filed an application dated December 22, 2023 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated January 09, 2024 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/24/00019) dated February 04, 2024. 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. **Requests made in the application** –The appellant, vide his application dated December 22, 2023 sought the following information:

ABOVE ARE 2 REPAYMENT ORDERS PASSED BY SEBI ON NEEEA TECHNOLOGIES LTD IN 2016 AND 2020 AGAINST DEFAULT IN NCDs AND OCDs COLLECTED WORTH @7 CR IN 2013.TILL DATE THERE IS NO INFORMATION COMING FROM SEBI ON WHAT THEY HAVE DONE TO RECOVER INVESTORS MONEY.WE ARE SENIOR CITIZENS WHO DONT HAVE MONEY TO FIGHT CASES IN VARIOUS COURTS.SEBI INSPIITE OF RTI HAS NOT GIVEN ANY PROCEEDING STATUS.IT IS NOW 10 PLUS YEARS . WHERE TO BEG FOR OUR MONEY?"

- Page 1 of 2

directions, recovery proceedings have been initiated in the matter and the same are ongoing. The respondent also provided information regarding the recovery certificate issued in the said matter.

4. **Ground of appeal-** The appellant in his appeal has sought additional information/details regarding the recovery process, copy of recovery certificate, etc.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. I find that the appellant in his application has *inter alia* sought information regarding the status of proceedings pertain to SEBI orders in the matter of Neesa Technologies Ltd. I note that in response to the aforesaid request, the respondent, has informed the appellant that SEBI had passed final order dated April 07, 2020 in the matter of Neesa Technologies Ltd., directing the company and its directors to refund the money collected through issuance and allotment of OCD'S. The respondent further informed that as the company and its directors failed to comply with the aforesaid directions, recovery proceedings have been initiated in the matter and the same are ongoing. The respondent also provided information regarding the recovery certificate issued in the said matter. On consideration, I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the request of the appellant regarding the status of the relevant matter. However, I note that the appellant in his appeal has *inter alia* sought additional information regarding the process of recovery, copy of recovery certificate, etc. I note that the appellant is now seeking new information pertaining to his application. As held by the Hon'ble Central Information Commission in *Harish Prasad Divedi vs. Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited* (decided on January 28, 2014), an information seeker cannot be allowed to expand the scope of his RTI enquiry at appeal stage. Accordingly, I find that the said submissions do not warrant consideration at this stage.
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: February 23, 2024

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