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

Appeal No. 7035 of 2026

Surajit Rout	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated June 11, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 ("**RTI Act**"). The respondent, by a letter dated July 10, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated August 11, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00304). I have perused the application, the response of the respondent 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, sought the following information:

"Please provide the following information in certified copy form with respect to Complaint No. SEBIE/WB26/EAST/017375/1:

1. Certified copy of the complete ATR (Action Taken Report), including all annexures, documents, records, and submissions received from Bigshare Services Pvt. Ltd., NSE, Angel One Ltd., Evonith Value Steel Ltd./Uttam Value Steels Ltd., Designated Body, or any other concerned entity.

2. Certified copy of the scrutiny report, examination note, review note, file notings, internal recommendations, observations, and final report prepared by or placed before the Adjudicating Officer/SEBI during the review and examination of the complaint after its auto-escalation to SEBI.

3. Certified copy of the final decision, order, disposal note, findings, recommendations, or any other record showing the final outcome of the complaint, along with all records relied upon by the Adjudicating Officer/SEBI while arriving at such decision, including documents relating to share extinguishment, consideration/payment, settlement, cash mobilisation, escrow *arrangements, cheque/payment details, bank transfer details, or any other shareholder compensation mechanism, if any, pertaining to my holding of 4230 shares of Uttam Value Steels Ltd. (ISIN: INE292A01023).”*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the status and the Action Taken Report (**ATR**) of Complaint No. SEBIE/WB26/EAST/017375/1 can be accessed by the appellant by logging into SCORES. The respondent also enclosed a copy of ATR along with his response. Further, respondent also informed that the appellant can refer to FAQ Nos. 15 and 22, available on the SCORES website for any other information related to access to complaints on SCORES.

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. On consideration, I note that the respondent has informed that the requested information can be accessed by the appellant by logging into SCORES portal. Accordingly, I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the query.

6. Further, I note that the appellant, in his appeal, has challenged the correctness of the response provided by the respondent. In this context, 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: September 09, 2026

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