

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

**Appeal No. 6916 of 2026**

Atul Kumar Thakur : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application dated February 20, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated February 27, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated June 06, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00210).
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 February 27, 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 June 06, 2026. The first appeal has been made after the last date permissible under the RTI Act. The appellant neither made a request for condoning the said delay in filing the appeal nor made any submission explaining the reasons which caused the delay. Considering the absence of a request for condoning the delay and any valid reason that prevented the appellant from filing the appeal in time, I consider this appeal as time barred and hence, liable to be dismissed on that count.
3. Notwithstanding the above observation, 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.
4. **Queries in the application** - The appellant, in his application sought the following information:

*“Kindly immediately provide information regarding grievances redressal for my complaint number UTT25100882 DATED 29-10-2025 made by sachet portal concerned with my father Prem Shankar Thakur purchased non-convertible redeemable debentures from weird infrastructure limited date 31 July 2012 of amount Rs. 100,000 (one lakh) nominated to my brother TUHIN KUMAR having folio number F-PTA-20086249 and certificate no.-M01-20086249-N. Although SEBI through notification order SEBI/NRO/RD/Weird Infra/78/2017 dated 21 July 2017 made to refund with interest to investors but still we do not get any information of payment by weird industries limited, therefore kindly I request to consider the financial loss caused after the death of our father dated 02-05-2021.”*

5. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the recovery proceedings have been initiated against Weird Infrastructure Corporation Ltd and its promoters/directors (hereinafter referred to as “defaulters”) vide Recovery Certificate No. 826 of 2015. Pursuant to the initiation of recovery proceedings in the matter, bank accounts, demat accounts, mutual fund portfolios, etc. of the defaulters have been attached vide attachment proceedings no. 2371 and 2372 of 2015 dated 04.12. 2015. The respondent also informed that pursuant to the issuance of the remittance advice to banks as on date Rs. 5, 60, 206/- have been recovered in the matter. Further, prohibitory orders dated 04.08. 2016 and 10.02.2017 have been issued inter alia prohibiting the defaulters from disposing of transferring or alienating properties mentioned therein.

The respondent also informed that during the course of recovery proceedings, the company submitted a scheme of proposal for refund to investors. The respondent also informed that the scheme of refund was examined by the recovery officer, SEBI and vide order dated 21.07. 2017, rejected the scheme/proposal of refund submitted by the company and ordered the defaulters inter alia to bring in the amount payable to the investors. However, the defaulters have failed to comply with the directions issued vide Order dated 21.07.2017 by the then Recovery Officer. The matter has been referred along with the case of Weird Industries Group of Companies to the Justice S.P Talukdar Committee constituted by the Hon’ble High Court at Calcutta (W.P. 12410 (W)/ 2015, along with three other Writ Petitions). As per the order, dated November 29, 2017 of the High Court, Committee shall examine the matter with the ultimate object of disbursing the sum to be realized from the assets of the company to the depositors. The respondent also provided the link for accessing Committee’s website.

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

7. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I note that the respondent has adequately addressed the queries by providing the information available with him.
8. Further, I note that appellant's appeal is in the nature of redressal of grievance. I note that redressal of grievance does not come under the purview of the RTI Act. In this context, I note that the Hon'ble Central Information Commission, in the matter of *Mr. Surendra Vishwakarma vs. President Secretariat* (Order dated April 29, 2016) observed that "*In this context, we note that the RTI Act cannot be used to make the respondent to do certain things or take certain action for the reason that the Act is not the proper law for redressal of grievances/ disputes and there are other appropriate forum(s) for resolving such matters.*" Accordingly, I find that no further interference of this forum is warranted.
9. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Place: Mumbai

Date: July 02, 2026

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