

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

Appeal No. 7079 of 2026

Sandesh Ranjit Sakhalkar : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated February 12, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated March 10, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated September 09, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00339).
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 March 10, 2026. 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 appeal was received on September 09, 2026. The first appeal has been made after the last date permissible under the RTI Act. The appellant, in his appeal, has requested for condonation of delay. Considering the appellant’s request, I am considering the appeal on merit. I have perused the application and the appeal and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record.
3. **Queries in the application** - The appellant, in his application, sought the following information:

“Under the Right to Information Act 2005 I request the following information regarding SEBI orders passed in the matter of M s Networth Marketing Limited including order dated 28 08 2017 and final order dated 30 07 2018 and recovery proceedings including Recovery Certificate No 1895 of 2019 I am seeking information only with respect to my father who is an affected investor I am enclosing documentary proof of relationship and identity

1. *Confirmation of inclusion*

Please confirm whether the following person is included in the Investor List

Annexure referred to in SEBI orders in the matter of M s Networth Marketing Limited

Investor Name Ranjit Shrikrishna xxxxxx PAN BGIPxxxxx

Investor Address 15 B Prabhukripa Opposite Jondhale School Shastrinagar Dombivli West Thane 421202

Investor Contact 92210xxxxxx Approx Year of Investment 2015 Approx Amount Invested 200000

2. *Relationship proof*

Investor and Applicant relationship proof documents are attached Applicants birth certificate attached

3. *Refund status*

Please provide the current refund recovery status for my father

Whether refund has been paid Yes No

If paid date of payment and mode Cheque NEFT etc If not paid amount pending

4. *Claim process*

*Please provide the procedure and required documents to claim the refund amount for
a the investor himself*

b legal heirs in case the investor is unable to claim due to age health

5. *SEBI contact point*

Please provide the name designation office address email and phone number of the SEBI department official responsible for investor refund recovery in this matter for follow up

I request that the information be provided in electronic form PDF”

4. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to query no. 1, informed that the name of Ranjit Shrikrishna Sakhalkar is present in the investor list submitted by Company i.e., Networth Marketing limited.

With regard to query no. 2, the respondent stated that no information was sought vide the query.

With regard to query nos. 3, 4 & 5, the respondent informed that pursuant to WTM Order dated July 30, 2018, the Company had submitted that Rs. 1,00,000/- (Rs. 50,000 and Rs. 50,000) was paid by cash to Ranjit Shrikrishna Sakhalkar.

Further, respondent stated that that the recovery proceeding is under process. The respondent also stated that as and when a refund to investors is initiated, the same will be intimated to eligible investors along with the claim process and SEBI contact point.

5. **Ground of appeal** The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was provided incomplete, misleading or false information.
6. 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.
7. Further, I note that the appellant, in his appeal, has sought further information pertaining to his application. As held by the Hon'ble Central Information Commission 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.
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: October 07, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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