

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

Appeal No. 6658 of 2026

Shefali Lahoti : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated November 18, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated December 12, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00329) dated December 16, 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. The appellant, in her appeal, has raised dissatisfaction only with respect to the response of the respondent to query nos. 3 to 9 in the application.
3. **Query nos. 3 to 9 in the application** - The appellant, vide query nos. 3 to 9, sought the following information regarding her complaint filed with SEBI:

“I request information under the Right to Information Act 2005 regarding my physical complaint against ab Ventures Angel Fund DIN NO 02908456 and Mr Harshad Lahoti. The complaint along with supporting documents was sent to SEBI by speed post on 12 August 2025 and addressed to Rajesh Gujjar Head of Supervision Enforcement and Complaints Department AFD.

I seek the following information

.....

3. Confirmation on whether SEBI has carried out any preliminary examination of my complaint Yes or No.

4. Confirmation on whether SEBI has identified any *prima facie* violations of the SEBI Act 1992 the SEBI Intermediaries Regulations SEBI Master Circulars and KYC or POA guidelines Yes or No.

5. Confirmation on whether a Violation Report ViR has been prepared by SEBI in connection with my complaint Yes or No.

6. If the answer is yes please provide the date on which the ViR was prepared or forwarded to the concerned Division Head only the date no internal details.

7. Confirmation on whether SEBI has forwarded the matter to the Market Intermediaries Regulation and Supervision Department MIRSD the Enforcement Department or the Integrated Surveillance Department Yes or No and the date of forwarding.

8. Confirmation on whether SEBI has initiated any of the following actions and the respective dates only Yes or No with dates

a Show Cause Notice

b Warning Letter

c Inspection

d Supervisory Review

e Enquiry Proceedings

f Enforcement Proceedings

9. The name and official designation of the SEBI officer or the department currently handling my complaint no personal details requested only the official role."

4. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to query nos. 3 to 8, informed that the information sought is in the nature of seeking clarification/confirmation. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as "information", as defined u/s 2(f) of the RTI Act.

The respondent, in response to query no. 9, informed that the information sought relates to personal information, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest and may also endanger the life or physical safety of the person(s). The same is, therefore, exempt in terms of Section 8(1)(g) of the RTI Act.

5. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that she was refused access to the information requested.

6. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. With regard to query nos. 3 to 8, I concur with the response of the respondent that the queries are in the nature of seeking clarification/confirmation to interrogative queries. I find that the said queries cannot be construed as seeking 'information' as defined under section 2(f) of the RTI Act. Consequently, the respondent did not have an obligation to provide such clarification or confirmation under the RTI Act. In this context, reliance is placed on the matter of *Laxman Prasad Kayal vs. CPIO, State Bank of India* (Order dated June 20, 2023), wherein the Hon'ble Central Information Commission (**CIC**) held that "*9. The Commission based on a perusal of the facts on record finds that the dissatisfaction of the Appellant with the reply provided by the CPIO is bereft of merit as the RTI Application merely seeks for clarifications and answers to interrogative queries.* Accordingly, I did not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.

7. With regard to query no. 9, I find that the information about SEBI official(s) is in the nature of personal information, the disclosure of which may also endanger the life or physical safety to person(s). I find that Hon'ble CIC in the matter of *Shri V. Raj vs. Dr. G. Narayana Raju* (Decision dated August 22, 2007) had ruled that: "*... a public servant contributing to a decision is entitled to his anonymity*". In *H. E. Rajashekarappa vs. State Public Information Officer and Ors.*, the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka had ruled that: "*... it cannot be said that section 2(f) of the Act (the RTI Act) encompasses the personal information of the officials of the public authority. The intention of the legislation is to provide right to information to a citizen pertaining to public affairs of the public authority*". Further, 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 sections 8(1)(g) and 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act.

8. Further, I note that the appellant, in her appeal, has sought copies of file notings related to her complaint, action taken report etc. On, consideration, I find that the appellant is now seeking new information pertaining to her application. As held by the Hon'ble CIC in *Harish Prasad Divedi vs. Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited* (decided on January 28, 2014), an information seeker cannot be allowed to expand the scope of his RTI enquiry at appeal stage. Accordingly, I find that the said submissions do not warrant consideration at this stage.

9. 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: January 08, 2026

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