

**BEFORE THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND FIRST APPELLATE AUTHORITY
INSOLVENCY AND BANKRUPTCY BOARD OF INDIA**

7th Floor, Mayur Bhawan, Shankar Market,
Connaught Circus, New Delhi -110001

Dated: 7th October 2025

**Order under section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) in respect of RTI
Appeal Registration No. ISBBI/A/E/25/000116**

IN THE MATTER OF

Mohit Rasiklal Mehta

...Appellant

Vs.

Central Public Information Officer

The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India

7th Floor, Mayur Bhawan, Shankar Market,

Connaught Circus, New Delhi -110001

... Respondent

-
1. The Appellant has filed the present Appeal dated 3rd September 2025, challenging the communication of the Respondent, filed under the Right to Information Act (RTI Act). Since the information required detailed analysis of different provisions of the RTI Act, same is disposed of within 45 days as enshrined under Section 19(6) of the RTI Act.
 2. The Appellant had sought the following information,
*“1) Seeking information about number of days within which certificate of practice of any RV or RVE is ceased by RVO and number of days within which such RV/ RVE registration is suspended by RVO and IBBI, soon declared as semi complaint or non-complaint.
2) Seeking copy of circular or circular number if already available in IBBI portal, under which The RVO can give opportunity to RV or RVE to remain semi complaint or non-complaint for specified number of days and after the specified period is over RV / RVE registration as Registered Valuer is either suspended or cancelled and against their name on IBBI website remark is placed. In absence of any such circular or guidelines by competent authority, does RVO needs to report non-compliant / semi complaint status of RV / RVE to IBBI if so, seeking information for what period in time such non complaint or semi complaint or RV who has never obtained certificate of Practice, their name can be displayed on IBBI website, without any remark against their name.”*

The Respondent CPIO has replied to the Appellant, in the following words, “*The information sought is in the nature of clarification, which does not fall within the definition of 'information' under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act, 2005. However, the RTI seeker may access the Companies (Registered Valuers and Valuation) Rules, 2017 in the URL : [https://ibbi.gov.in/uploads/register Regulations 1 .pdf](https://ibbi.gov.in/uploads/register%20Regulations%201.pdf).”* Aggrieved with the reply, the Appellant has filed the present Appeal contending that that the CPIO has wrongly denied the information sought since the same is held by IBBI and it is not available on the IBBI website. Moreover, the Appellant has sought directions to the CPIO to furnish the information sought in public interest.

3. I have carefully examined the applications, the responses of the Respondent and the Appeals and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record. In terms of section 2(f) of the RTI Act ‘information’ means “*any material in any form, including records, documents, memos e-mails, opinions, advices, press releases, circulars, orders, logbooks, contracts, reports, papers, samples, models, data material held in any electronic form and information relating to any private body which can be accessed by a public authority under any other law for the time being in force.*” It is pertinent to note that the Appellant’s “right to information” flows from section 3 of the RTI Act and the said right is subject to other provisions of the Act. Section 2(j) of the RTI Act defines the “right to information” in term of *information* accessible under the Act which is held by or is under the control of a public authority. Thus, if the public authority holds any information in the form of data, statistics, abstracts, etc. an applicant can have access to the same under the RTI Act subject to exemptions under section 8.
4. The Appellant has sought a circular issued by IBBI permitting an RVO to classify an RV/RVE as semi-compliant or non-compliant for a specified period before suspension or cancellation of registration. Moreover, the Appellant seeks clarification on whether, in absence of such circulars or guidelines, an RVO is required to report the non-compliant/semi-compliant status of an RV/RVE to IBBI, and for how long such names may appear on the IBBI website without any remarks. In this regard, it is pertinent to note that the information sought is in the nature of inquiries/advice, which is beyond the ambit of information under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act. The CPIO is not obligated to render advice on clarifications/inquiries as sought by the Appellant. In this context, I note that Hon’ble Supreme Court of India, in the matter of *Central Board of Secondary Education & Anr. vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay & Ors* [2011 (8) SCC 497 dated 09.08.2011], has held that:

“...A public authority is not required to provide ‘advice’ or ‘opinion’ to an applicant, nor required to obtain and furnish any ‘opinion’ or ‘advice’ to an applicant. The reference to ‘opinion’ or ‘advice’ in the definition of ‘information’ in section 2(f) of the Act, only refers to such material available in the records of the public authority. Many public authorities have, as a public relation exercise, provide advice, guidance and opinion to the citizens. But that is purely voluntary and should not be confused with any obligation under the RTI Act.”
5. In order to promote the interest of transparency, the Appellant can access the IBBI website at <https://ibbi.gov.in/en/service-provider/registered-valuer-orgs> and <https://ibbi.gov.in/en/service-provider/registered-valuers> to seek information pertaining to the impugned Appeal. In view of the foregoing, the Appeal does not merit any interference with the response of the CPIO.

6. The Appeal is, accordingly, disposed of.

Sd/-
(Kulwant Singh)
First Appellate Authority

Copy to:

1. Appellant, Mohit Rasiklal Mehta
2. CPIO, The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India, 7th Floor, Mayur Bhawan, Shankar Market, Connaught Circus, New Delhi -110001.