

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

Appeal No. 4985 of 2022

S. K. Chhibber	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated February 07, 2022 (received by SEBI on February 10, 2022) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated March 04, 2022, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated March 31, 2022 (received by the Office of Appellate Authority on April 11, 2022). 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, vide query number 1 of his application dated February 07, 2022, *inter alia*, sought the copy of intimation letter(s) from Reliance industries Ltd. (RIL) to SEBI regarding acquisition of shares of RIL by certain officers during June 2014 and March 2021 as reported/intimated to Stock Exchanges and SEBI. Vide query number 2, the appellant sought copies of appropriate enforcement actions under SEBI Act, 1992 and Regulations/ Rules framed thereunder, in case of violations established against the officers referred to in query number 1.
3. The respondent, in response to the aforesaid queries, informed that the queries are not clear and specific and accordingly, the same cannot be construed as seeking “information” as defined under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act. The respondent also informed that any regulatory action taken by SEBI is available in the public domain, on the SEBI website. Further, the respondent provided the link/path for accessing the same.
4. **Ground of appeal-** On perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response provided by the respondent. The appellant, in his appeal, *inter alia*, submitted that the respondent should have either supplied a copy of the document or denied. The appellant also

submitted that the respondent has erred in invoking and applying the principle of clear and specific in the present case.

5. I have perused the queries and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I am inclined to agree with the observation of the respondent that the query is not clear and specific. In this context, I note that in the matter of *Shri S. C. Sharma vs. CPIO, Securities and Exchange Board of India* (Decision dated August 30, 2012), the Hon'ble CIC held: "*Since the Appellant had not clearly stated what exact information he wanted, the CPIO could not have provided any specific information to him. We would like to advise the Appellant that he might like to specify the exact information he wants from the SEBI and prefer a fresh application before the CPIO.*" I find that the appellant's queries cannot be construed as seeking "information" as defined under section 2(f) of the RTI Act. In view of these observations, I find that the respondent is not obliged to provide a response where the information sought is not specific. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response.
6. Further, I note that respondent has guided the appellant to access the orders which are issued by SEBI under the provisions of the SEBI Act, 1992 and rules/ regulations framed thereunder.
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: May 06, 2022

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