

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

**Appeal Nos. 6714 & 6715 of 2026**

Ajay Singh : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed two identical applications (RTI Reg. No. SEBIH/R/T/25/00234 & RTI Reg No. SEBIH/R/T/25/00233) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”), which was transferred to the respondent from Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority of India and LOKPAL, on November 13 & 14, 2025, respectively. The respondent, by a common letter dated December 12, 2025 responded to the applications filed by the appellant. The appellant filed two appeals (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00036 and Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00037) dated January 29, 2026.
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 December 12, 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 appeals were received on January 29, 2026. The first appeals have 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 appeals 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 these appeal as time barred and hence, liable to be dismissed on that count.
3. Notwithstanding the above observation, I am considering the 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 applications** - The appellant, in his applications, sought the following information:

*“ Govt india appointing fraud in govt offices and post.and fake itr filing and wrong info during appoint ment by kv kamath and madhabipuri buch and sh nimesh shah.Matter of cyber crime and perjury wrong fully collecting fake money from public.annexure is attached. smt madababi puri buch and kv kamath Professional qualification experinece records. I m sure sh kv kamathmnimesh shah and madhabhi puri buch gave correct information of employment and its companies. as well filed correct rti. matter related to forcing fake itr,fraudelently taking money from bank accounts. icicpruamc comes under irda.so information from icicpruamc is given to irda.if not provide through icicpruamc.*

*(1) pan number and bank account number and servicetax number,nature of business(in de 2007)icicibank,icicibrokerageservices ltd,icicisecuritiesltd,icicpddealership(icicisecuritiesltd). (last four digits).matter is related to perjury with high court mumbai and supremecourt of india.*

*(2) mrs madhabi puri buch employment records .as the information attached in annexure(in dec 2007) she was working in dec 2007 as icicibank director.from 1998 to 2021 her career records and salary records. DIR NAME OF EXISTING COMPANIES MENTIONESDIN ANNEXURE.*

*(3) bata deal records and pan number of broker and name.in bse .icicibrokerage services ltd (pan number) and directors name.from bse and bata company. I*

*(4) sh nimesh shah is chartered accountant he can give any fake information in public domain.from icai. a chartered accountant can do fraud and cyber crime and give fake information in public and collect money and file wrong itr.please check records.*

*(5) total cyber crime done by brokers and fir registered by rbi and sebi and irda against brokers,and employees and companies.*

*(6) case file of sakshi gupta icicibank employee. case is registered at kota police station.*

*(7) whatsapp information of icicidirect ceo and mamta shetty. information updated by ceo and mamata shetty to govt and courts and lokpal ,mumbai police and rajasthan police.*

*(8) total stt,service tax , and money collected by icicibrokerageservicesltd by icicibrokerage servicesltd in 2013 and pan number and stt numner and directors name.*

*(9) a govt employee can verify fake records.*

*(10) leaking any taxpayer or any citizens bank account ,credit card details and bank details is cyber crime or not.what is action can be taken against a govt employee.*

*(11) one pan two name in pan and at nse and bse-as per incometax act or its cyber crime.*

*kindly provide all information as available . matter related to padma awardee and ex sebi chairman.”*

5. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to queries in the application, informed that the information sought is not available with SEBI.
6. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was refused access to the information requested.
7. I have perused the applications and the response provided thereto. The respondent, in his response, has categorically mentioned that the requested information is not available with SEBI. In this context, I note that the Hon’ble Central Information Commission in the matter of *Sh. Pattipati Rama Murthy vs. CPIO, SEBI* (Decision dated July 8, 2013), held: “... *if it (SEBI) does not have any such information in its possession, the CPIO cannot obviously invent one for the benefit of the Appellant. There is simply no information to be given.*” Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
8. 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 17, 2026

**RUCHI CHOJER**

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