

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

**Appeal No. 6620 of 2025**

Anand S Daga : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application dated October 09, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 ("**RTI Act**"). The respondent, by a letter dated November 06, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00297) dated November 18, 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 09, 2025, sought the following information.

*"I am filing this application under Section 6(1) of the Right to Information Act 2005 seeking the following information pertaining to the freezing of a particular Permanent Account Number PAN that may have been carried out under SEBI directions or communications to any intermediary depository participant or other regulated entity. Kindly provide the following information:*

- 1. Whether SEBI has issued or directed any order communication or instruction for the freezing of the PAN bearing Mahesh S Malu PAN No XXXXX*
- 2. If yes please provide the date and reference number of such freezing order or communication issued by SEBI or its concerned division.*
- 3. Please provide the current status of the said PAN whether it continues to remain frozen or has been unfrozen or released.*

4. *In case the PAN is still under freeze kindly provide the current stage or progress of the related proceedings or application for unfreezing including the division or office presently handling the matter.*

5. *If available kindly provide the name and designation of the SEBI officer or department currently dealing with or supervising the said case."*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to the application, 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** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was refused access to the information requested.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. I note that that the respondent has denied the requested information under section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act. The appellant has sought information pertaining to freezing of PAN of a third party, viz., Mahesh S Malu vide query nos. 1 to 3 in the application. In this context, reference is made to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the matter of *Central Public Information Officer, Supreme Court of India Vs. Subhash Chandra Agarwal* in Civil Appeal No. 10044 of 2010 with Civil Appeal No. 10045 of 2010 and Civil Appeal No. 2683 of 2010 (judgement dated November 13, 2019) wherein the import of "personal information" envisaged under Section 8(1)(j) of RTI Act has been exemplified in the context of earlier ratios laid down by the same Court in other matter(s). The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that: *"59. Reading of the aforesaid judicial precedents, in our opinion, would indicate that personal records, including name, address, physical, mental and psychological status, marks obtained, grades and answer sheets, are all treated as personal information. Similarly, professional records, including qualification, performance, evaluation reports, ACRs, disciplinary proceedings, etc. are all personal information. Medical records, treatment, choice of medicine, list of hospitals and doctors visited, findings recorded, including that of the family members, information relating to assets, liabilities, income tax returns, details of investments, lending and borrowing, etc. are personal information. Such personal information is entitled to protection from unwarranted invasion of privacy and conditional access is available when stipulation of larger public interest is satisfied. This list is indicative and not exhaustive..."* In view of these observations, I agree with the response of the respondent that the requested information relates to personal information of third party, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest and may cause unwarranted invasion into the privacy of the individual and may also endanger the life or physical safety of the person(s). Accordingly, no further intervention is warranted at this stage.

6. Further, vide query nos. 4 and 5, the respondent has sought the name of the SEBI officer handling the matter. I find that the information sought about SEBI official(s) 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 and may also endanger the life or physical safety to the person. In this regard, I note that the Hon'ble CIC in the matter of *Prerit Misra vs. CPIO, SEBI* (order dated November 21, 2022) held that- *"It is pertinent to mention here that the appellant in a similar case which was dealt in File no. CIC/SEBIE/A/2019/660770 dated 10.08.2021 whereby he had sought information regarding the names of the officers who had blocked his email address, the Commission, while passing an order had held that such information is exempted u/s 8(1)(g) & 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act. The Commission after considering the submissions of the appellant finds no merit in his case, and also is in agreement with the order of the FAA and concludes that the information is exempt u/s 8(1)(g) & 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, hence, no relief can be given."* In view of these observations, I find that the requested information is exempt from disclosure under section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act.
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**