

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

Appeal No. 6622 of 2025

Sapankumar Rathi : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated October 03, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated October 23, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00298) dated November 19, 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. **Queries in the application** - The appellant, in his application dated October 03, 2025, sought the following information.

“1. I want to know the status of my vigilance complaint no. VIGILANCE/2025/332028 filed by me

2. i want to why im unable to check the status of my complaint and why restricted to get OPT to me on my email as well on mobile”

3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to query nos. 1 and 2 in the application, informed that the appellant’s complaint bearing registration no. VIGILANCE/2025/332028 was not in the nature of vigilance complaint. Hence, the same was closed with following remarks:

*“ Vigilance Complaint Portal is meant only for **lodging corruption against SEBI employees**. The instant complaint is not a corruption complaint against employees of SEBI. Hence, the complaint is closed on this portal.....”*

4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was provided incomplete, misleading or false information.

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 information available with him. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
6. I also note that appellant in his appeal has challenged the correctness of the response to his application. In this regard, 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 view of the aforesaid observation, I find that the said submission of the appellant does not warrant consideration at this stage. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
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: December 12, 2025

RUCHI CHOJER

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