

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

**Appeal No.6662 of 2026**

|                    |    |            |
|--------------------|----|------------|
| Rahul Dhuper       | :  | Appellant  |
|                    | Vs |            |
| CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai | :  | Respondent |

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application dated October 27, 2025 (received by SEBI on November 14, 2025) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated November 26, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated December 11, 2025 (received by the Office of Appellate Authority on December 18, 2025). 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, vide his application dated October 27, 2025, sought the following information:

*“ 1. Certified copies of the reply filed by Sardar Sarovar Narmada Nigam Limited (SSNNL) in response to my complaint, during July 2014.*

*2. Certified copies of the reply filed by MCS Ltd. (Registrar of SSNNL) during July 2014.*

*3. Certified copies of all closure/disposal letters or communications issued by SEBI in July 2014 with reference to the above complaint numbers.*

*4. Details of the actid taken by SEBI on the said complaints, including whether SEBI has initiated or conducted any investigation, inquiry,*

*or proceedings against SSNNL and/or MCS Ltd. in connection with my complaints.*

*5. If any such investigation, inquiry, or proceeding was initiated, kindly provide the current status and outcome of the same, along with certified copies of relevant orders or communications.*

*6. Please provide the name, designation, and department of the SEBI officer or investigating officer who was assigned or responsible for handling or examining my complaint during the relevant period. “*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the complaint status and Action Taken Report is available on SCORES website and the same can be accessed by logging in with applicant's login credentials.

Further, with regards to query regarding investigation, it was informed that SEBI will neither confirm nor deny the existence of investigation in any specific matter. SEBI conducts investigation to examine alleged or suspected violation of laws and Regulations related to securities market. Post investigation, whenever violations are established, appropriate enforcement actions are taken under the provisions of the SEBI Act, 1992 and Regulations framed thereunder which culminate in the issuance of Orders. These Orders are available in public domain and can be accessed from SEBI website.

4. **Ground of appeal** – On perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response of the respondent.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I note that the respondent has informed that the action taken report and the status of his complaint can be accessed by the appellant by logging to SEBI Complaint Redressal System (SCORES). However, the appellant, in his appeal, has claimed that his complaint pertains to the year 2014, when SCORES did not exist/was not fully operational. I find that the appellant in his appeal is challenging the correctness of the response provided by the respondent. It is pertinent to note that the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in *Narendra Tyagi vs. Assistant Director (CPIO)* (Decision dated December 06, 2023) has held: “*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 aforementioned observation, I find that the submission of the appellant does not require further consideration. Notwithstanding the above observation, the appellant may note that SCORES was launched in the year 2011 vide circular dated June 3, 2011 (bearing reference number CIR/OIAE/2/2011).

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: January 14, 2026

**RUCHI CHOJER**

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