

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

Appeal No. 6430 of 2025

Pushpa Chugh	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated Nil (received by SEBI on April 25, 2025) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated April 29, 2025, transferred the said application to Reserve Bank of India (“**RBI**”). The appellant had filed an appeal dated June 10, 2025 (received by Office of the Office of Appellate Authority on June 13, 2025), protesting the transfer of her 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 April 29, 2025. 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 June 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. Considering the absence of a request for condoning the delay and any valid reason that prevented the appellant from filing the appeal in time, I consider this appeal as time barred and hence, liable to be dismissed on that count.
3. The appellant, in her appeal, has contended that even though she had filed the RTI application with respondent, a reply was received not from SEBI but from Ms. Namrata Shukla, CPIO, RBI. The respondent in her appeal has argued that obligations under section 6(3) of the RTI Act was not complied with by the respondent and that her application was incorrectly transferred to RBI. The

appellant in her appeal has requested the instant forum to direct the concerned public information officer to provide the requested information and also to inquire into the irregular and unjustified transfer of the RTI application.

4. As per section 6(3) of the RTI Act, onus is placed on the public authority who receives the RTI application to transfer the application to the concerned public authority when the information sought is held by another public authority or the subject matter is closely connected with the functions of another public authority. Further, the public authority is also bound to inform the applicant about such transfer. In the present matter, vide letter dated April 29, 2025, respondent transferred the application to concerned CPIO, RBI as according to the respondent, the subject matter of application relates to fraudulent gold loans which pertains to issues under the purview of RBI. Further, a copy of the said letter was also sent to the appellant. Accordingly, I find that respondent has complied with the provisions of section 6(3) of RTI Act and thus, no deficiency is found in the action of the respondent.
5. Further, I note from the perusal of the appeal and letter of the respondent dated April 29, 2025, that the appellant had mistakenly considered the copy of letter sent by the respondent to CPIO, RBI, which was marked to appellant, as a reply from the said CPIO of RBI.
6. In view of the above observations, I find that no further interference of this forum is warranted. The appeal is accordingly, disposed of.

Place: Mumbai
Date: July 03, 2025

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