

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

Appeal No. 6411 of 2025

Geeta Khattar : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated May 02, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated May 21, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00113) dated May 30, 2025. 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. **Query in the application** - The appellant, in her application dated May 02, 2025, sought the following information:

“ Please provide a copy of the Investigation Report issued by the Investigating Officers (IOs) and CVO, SEBI under the complaint ref. no. 87115/2025, 87242/2025 & 87937/2025, that received by the Central Vigilance Commission (CVC) through its online portal on 20, 21 & 24/01/2025.”
3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the Vigilance Department of SEBI has not received any CVC portal complaint of Ms. Geeta Khattar with respect to complaint ref. no. 87937/2025. Notwithstanding the aforesaid, the respondent informed that the outcome of two CVC complaints with ref. no. 87115/2025 and 87242/2025 have been updated on CVC portal in terms of CVC Circular No. 24/11/2022 dated 03/11/2022 and Circular No. 07/06/24 dated June 28, 2024. The same is also accessible to the complainant.

Further, the respondent informed that the information sought relates to personal information, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest and may cause unwarranted invasion into the privacy of the individual. The same is, therefore, exempt in terms of Section 8(1) (j) of the RTI Act.

4. **Ground of appeal** – On perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response of the respondent. The appellant in her appeal has submitted that she has inadvertently mentioned the complaint reference no. as 87937/2025 instead of 87927/ 2025. The appellant in her application has contended that the information sought by her does not pertain to personal information and that the respondent is duty bound to provide the copy of investigation report under the RTI Act.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the queries by providing the outcome of the complaints mentioned by the appellant in her application. Further, I find no infirmity in the denial of the investigation report by the respondent under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act. In this context, I note that in the matter of *Girish Ramchandra Deshpande vs. Central Information Commissioner* (judgement dated October 03, 2012), the Hon'ble Supreme Court held: “ "13. We are in agreement with the CIC and the courts below that the details called for by the Petitioner i.e. copies of all memos issued to the third Respondent, show cause notices and orders of censure/punishment etc. are qualified to be personal information as defined in Clause (j) of Section 8(1) of the RTI Act. The performance of an employee/officer in an organization is primarily a matter between the employee and the employer and normally those aspects are governed by the service rules which fall under the expression "personal information", the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest. On the other hand, the disclosure of which would cause unwarranted invasion of privacy of that individual. Of course, in a given case, if the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer of the Appellate Authority is satisfied that the larger public interest justifies the disclosure of such information, appropriate orders could be passed but the Petitioner cannot claim those details as a matter of right.” Further, Hon'ble CIC in its decision in *Kamlesh v CPIO, CVC & Ors.* (Date of decision:18.02.2025), having similar facts and circumstances as that of the present case, has accepted the denial of investigation report on the grounds under section 8(1)(j) of RTI Act. In view of the said judgements, I agree with the response of the respondent that the requested information is exempt from disclosure under section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act. Further, the appellant has not established existence of larger public interest in seeking the information. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response.

6. The appellant in her appeal has submitted that she had inadvertently mentioned the complaint reference no. as 87937/2025 instead of 87927/ 2025. I find that as the requested information is exempt from the disclosure under section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, no action is warranted in this regard.
7. 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: June 23, 2025

RUCHI CHOJER

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