

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

**Appeal No. 5417 of 2022**

|                      |    |            |
|----------------------|----|------------|
| Anupam Bhattacharjee | :  | Appellant  |
|                      | Vs |            |
| CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai   | :  | Respondent |

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application dated September 14, 2022 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated September 14, 2022 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/22/00581) dated September 15, 2022. 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, vide his application dated September 14, 2022, sought the following information:

*“I need to know why my money is still not refunded even after 2 months, when my mutual fund investment order was rejected in zerodha”*
3. The respondent, in response to the aforesaid query, informed that the query is vague and not specific. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as seeking “information”, as defined under section 2(f) of the RTI Act. The respondent also provided information regarding lodging of grievance on the SCORES portal of SEBI and tracking the status of the same. Further, the respondent provided the toll free helpline numbers launched by SEBI to facilitate replies to various queries of the general public on matters related to securities market. Further, the appellant was advised to refer to the FAQs on “Investor Grievances- SCORES”, available on the SEBI website. The respondent also provided the link for accessing the said FAQs.

4. **Ground of appeal-** The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that the information provided was incomplete, misleading or false. The appellant, in his appeal, submitted that the application was disposed of without proper information.
5. I have perused the query raised by the appellant. I find that the same is vague and not specific. Further, it is difficult to ascertain what exact information has been sought by the appellant. 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.*" In view of the same, I do not find any deficiency in the response.
6. Notwithstanding the same, I find that the respondent has guided the appellant to refer to the SCORES website for lodging his grievance, if any. The respondent also provided the helpline service numbers launched by SEBI, to facilitate replies to various queries of the general public on matters relating to securities market.
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: October 12, 2022

**A SUNIL KUMAR**  
**APPELLATE AUTHORITY UNDER THE RTI ACT**  
**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA**