

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

**Appeal No. 5518 of 2022; Appeal No. 5519 of 2022; Appeal No. 5520 of 2022;
Appeal No. 5521 of 2022**

	:	Appellant
Geeta Khattar		
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed 4 applications during the period from October 14, 2022 to December 11, 2022 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, vide letters dated October 25, 2022; December 06, 2022 and two letters dated December 15, 2022 responded to the said applications filed by the appellant. The appellant filed 4 appeals (Appeal No. SEBIH/A/E/22/00663 dated December 07, 2022; Appeal No. SEBIH/A/E/22/00664 dated December 08, 2022; Appeal No. SEBIH/A/E/22/00675 dated December 20, 2022 and Appeal No. SEBIH/A/E/22/00679 dated December 27, 2022) against the responses provided by the respondent. Since these matters pertain to the same party, the appeals are clubbed together for disposal.
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, one of the impugned responses from the respondent is dated October 25, 2022. 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 appeal was received on December 07, 2022. 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. Considering the absence of a request for condoning the delay and any valid reason that prevented the appellant from filing the appeal in time, the said appeal is liable to be dismissed.

3. Notwithstanding the above observation, I am considering all the four appeals on merit. I have perused the applications and the appeals and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record.
4. **Queries in the application** –The appellant, vide above mentioned 4 applications, *inter alia*, sought information regarding complaints filed by her on various government portals and SCORES Portal. The appellant also sought information regarding appeals filed by appellant before the Hon'ble CIC. The appellant also sought copy of order passed by SEBI against Kotak Securities officials.
5. The respondent, in response to the applications, provided point wise information available with him. The respondent also informed that certain queries have been addressed in the past and the appellant was advised to refer to the information already provided by the respondent.
6. **Ground of appeal-** The appellant has filed the appeals on the ground that the information provided was incomplete, misleading or false. On perusal of the appeals, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response provided by the respondent. The appellant, in her appeals, *inter alia*, submitted that SEBI is bound to provide the information sought by the appellant.
7. I have perused the applications and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I find that point wise reply has been provided to the queries raised by the appellant. Further, I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the applications by providing the information available with him. I find that no further intervention of this forum is warranted at this stage. However, from the information available on the RTI Portal, I note that the appellant has filed numerous applications under the RTI Act seeking information with respect to complaints filed by her in various government portals. Further, the appellant has filed 263 appeals as on date with this forum through the online RTI Portal. I am constrained to state that the appellant has been filing complaints with various organizations and then following up the same with multiple applications/ appeals on the RTI Portal. I note that most of the applications are repetitive in nature. In the context of filing multiple complaints and then following the same with the RTI applications, I note that in the matter of *Public Information Officer, Registrar (Administration) vs. B. Bharathi.*, (Order dated 17.09.2014 in W.P. No. 26781/2013), the Hon'ble High Court of Madras held as under-

"... The action of the second respondent in sending numerous complaints and representations and then following the same with the RTI applications; that it cannot be the way to redress his grievance; that he cannot overload a public authority and divert its resources disproportionately while seeking information and that the dispensation of information should not occupy

the majority of time and resource of any public authority, as it would be against the larger public interest..." The Hon'ble CIC, in the matter of *Samir Sardana vs. CPIO, Mormugao Port Trust* (order dated March 01, 2021) also referred to the said observations made by the Hon'ble High Court, while dismissing the appeal.

8. I note that the Hon'ble CIC, in the matter of *Ajay Gupta v. PIO and others* (order dated February 25, 2021) observed that *"Before parting with these Second Appeals/ Complaint, the Commission observes that the Appellant has resorted to filing multiple RTI applications on issues which essentially pertain to his personal grievance. Even if the Commission were to reluctantly acknowledge that this is an attempt on the Appellant's part to fight corruption, the means adopted by him stifles and defeats the very purpose of the RTI Act. As much as a CPIO has a statutory responsibility of complying with the provisions of the RTI Act, it is also expected of the RTI Applicant/s to not undermine the spirit of the RTI Act by clogging the system with such a barrage of RTI applications, merely claiming that these are aimed at combatting corruption."*
9. In view of the above observations, no further intervention of this forum is warranted in these appeals. The appellant is advised not to file repetitive, frivolous and vexatious applications and appeals under the RTI Act, in the future. Accordingly, the appeals are dismissed.

Place: Mumbai

ANAND BAIWAR

Date: December 30, 2022

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