

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

Appeal No. 4845 of 2022

Subhash Chandra Agarwal	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated February 27, 2022 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated March 24, 2022, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated March 25, 2022. The appeal is being taken up for consideration and disposal today due to official exigency. 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. **Ground of appeal-** The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that the information provided was incomplete, misleading or false. On perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response provided to query numbers 1, 2, 3 and 4. In view of the submissions made by the appellant in his appeal, I am only dealing with the said queries and the response provided thereto, in the following paragraphs.
3. **Query numbers 1 and 2-** The appellant, vide query numbers 1 and 2, sought the following information-
 1. *Web-link providing disclosure made under section 4(1)(b)(x) of RTI Act regarding the monthly remuneration received by each of its officers and employees, including the system of compensation as provided in its regulations.*
 2. *In case such a disclosure is not already made as per provisions of section 4(1)(b)(x), then a copy of such disclosure as referred in query above may be provided*
4. The respondent in response to query number 1, informed that the information sought may be accessed from the SEBI website. The respondent also provided the link for accessing the same. In response to query number 2, the respondent informed that in view of reply provided for query number 1, reply to query number 2 is not applicable. The appellant, in his appeal, *inter alia*, referred to Section 4(1)(b)(x) of

the RTI Act and requested that the respondent may be directed to revisit query numbers 1 and 2 of his application.

5. I have perused the queries and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the queries by guiding the appellant to access the requisite disclosures made by SEBI with respect to pay and allowances, which is available in public domain. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response.

6. **Query numbers 3 and 4-** The appellant, vide query numbers 3 and 4, sought the following information-

3. Other provisions of section 4(1)(b) of RTI Act added with other provisions as required in DoPT circular dated 15.04.2013 which are not mandatorily provided by SEBI on website

4. Steps taken by SEBI to mandatorily put complete information as per section 4(1)(b) of RTI Act also including as per section 4(1)(b)(x) of RTI Act and as per DoPT circular dated 15.04.2013.

7. In response to the aforesaid queries, the respondent informed that the queries are vague and not specific. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as seeking “information”, as defined under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act. However, the respondent advised the appellant to refer to the SEBI website for the various suo moto disclosures provided as per section 4(1)(b) of the RTI Act. The appellant, in his appeal, *inter alia*, submitted that the queries are specific especially in reference to the DoPT circular dated April 15, 2013.
8. I have perused query number 3 of the application. 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 *Sbri 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.*” In view of these observations, I find that the respondent is not obliged to provide a response where the information sought is vague and not specific.
9. With respect to query number 4, I find that SEBI makes various suo-moto disclosures on its website in accordance with the RTI Act and the said DoPT Circular. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response.

10. 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: April 27, 2022

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