

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

Appeal No. 6617 of 2025

Sachin Sharma : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated October 31, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated November 12, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00295) dated November 16, 2025. I have carefully considered the application, the response 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 dated October 31, 2025, sought the following information with reference to SEBI Circular dated May 18, 2022 on transmission of shares:

“ 1. Relevant Extract of Act/ Rules for calculation of applicable Stamp Duty for Annexure D , E and F to be submitted in compliance with SEBI circular dated May 18, 2022(attached)

2. Relevant extract of Act/Rules for calculation of amount of Stamp Duty of Affidavits, Indemnity Bonds & NOC (Annexure D , Annexure E and Annexure F of attached SEBI circular dated May 18, 2022) to be submitted for Transmission of State Bank of India Shares being executed by legal heirs in State of Chhattisgarh.

3. Amount of Stamp Duty of Affidavits, Indemnity Bonds & NOC (Annexure D , Annexure E and Annexure F of attached SEBI circular dated May 18, 2022) to be submitted for Transmission of State Bank of India Shares being executed by legal heirs in State of Chhattisgarh.”

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to application, informed that the stamp duty is applicable as per the stamp act of the respective state. The respondent also informed that the amount and calculation of the same does not fall under the regulatory jurisdiction of SEBI.
4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was provided incomplete, misleading or false information.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I note that the respondent has clearly informed that the amount and calculation of stamp duty does not fall under the purview of SEBI. Therefore, I find that the requested information is not available with SEBI. I note that the respondent can only provide information that is available in the records. In this context, I note that the Hon'ble Central Information Commission in the matter of *Sh. Pattipati Rama Murthy vs. CPIO, SEBI* (Decision dated July 8, 2013), held: “... *if it (SEBI) does not have any such information in its possession, the CPIO cannot obviously invent one for the benefit of the Appellant. There is simply no information to be given.*” Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
6. 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: December 11, 2025

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