

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

Appeal No. 6155 of 2024

Harbans Singh Sahni	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated August 29, 2024 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated September 12, 2024 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg.No. SEBIH/A/E/24/00215) dated September 12, 2024. 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. **Request in the application** - The appellant, vide his application dated August 29, 2024 sought the following information:

*“Information always it was stated under RTI Act it preatins to same issue i am filling with reference to company Gradiente infotainment Ltd Gradiente infotainment Ltd involving RTA
Total Number of Cases disposed by sebi preatins to Non Redessal of investor Grievance against complaint launched to sebi
Total Number of Cases disposed by sebi preatins Non Dispatch of shares in 1995, Dec 2010 under sebi Act against complaint launched to sebi
Total Number of cases disposed by sebi preatins to a settlement against complaint launched to sebi
Total Number of cases disposed by sebi preatins not under sebi preview against complaint launched to sebi
Total Number of case disposed by sebi preatins to outcome was not clear to sebi”*
3. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to the application, informed that queries raised by appellant were vague and not specific. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as "information", as defined u/s 2(f) of the RTI Act. The respondent further observed that the appellant’s matter was heard by the Hon’ble Central Information Commission (hereinafter referred to as “**CIC**”) ten times and orders were passed on various dates during the period from June 04, 2020 to November 10, 2022. Further, the appellant’s third application filed before the Hon’ble CIC was disposed of on December 23, 2021, *inter -*

alia, with the observation that the CPIO is not obliged to provide clarification/confirmations to the applicant with respect to redressal of his grievances. It was also observed that filing multiple RTI applications pertaining to similar issues will not entitle him to receive the requested information. Further, the Hon'ble CIC, advised and restrained the appellant from filing repeated RTI applications with respect to the similar issues in future. Similarly, the respondent referred to the other orders passed by the Hon'ble CIC in similar matters, wherein the appellant was, *inter alia*, advised to approach appropriate forum to redress his grievances. Accordingly, the respondent advised the appellant to restrain from filing repeated RTI applications with respect to similar issues on the subject matter in future and approach appropriate forum to redress his grievance.

4. **Ground of appeal** - The appellant filed the appeal on the ground that information provided was incomplete, misleading and false information.
5. I have perused the aforesaid request and the response provided thereto. I concur with the response of the respondent that the requests in the application are vague and not specific. It is an established law that the information sought for in order to be disc losable under the RTI Act, must be clear, specific and available in the records of the public authority. In this context, I note that the Hon'ble Central Information Commission in the matter of *Ms. Saria Jain vs National Hydroelectric Power Corporation Limited* (order dated April 25, 2014) held that "*As regards the first part i.e. copies of all documents in relation to the contracts mentioned in the RTI application, the Commission finds that the term "all" used by the Appellant here is very vague and does not pin point the particular document she wants to obtain from the Respondents. The Appellant is, therefore, advised to be more specific and identify the documents she wants to obtain from the Respondents ...*" Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent. Further, I note that the appellant, in his appeal, has made certain submissions, however, the same are also vague and not clear.
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: October 09, 2024

RUCHI CHOJER

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