

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

Appeal No. 5034 of 2022

Mukesh Chandra	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated March 21, 2022 (received by SEBI on March 23, 2022) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated April 07, 2022, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated April 25, 2022 (received by the Office of Appellate Authority on May 06, 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 3(i) of his application, *inter alia*, sought the date(s) of intimation to stock exchanges and SEBI the purchase of shares by the Group President (now 1st Director) of Reliance Industries Ltd. Vide query number 3(ii), the appellant sought the date(s) of the said transactions uploaded on stock exchanges and SEBI with the number of shares and its value. The appellant, vide query number 3(iii), *inter alia*, sought the copies of Regulatory/Enforcement action(s) initiated by SEBI on the said person and RIL, for lapses and failure to comply with SEBI Act, 1992 and rules made thereunder.
3. The respondent, in response to the aforesaid queries, informed that the disclosures concerning section 7(2) of the SEBI (PIT) Regulations regarding acquisition/disposal of securities by the promoter, member of the promoter group, designated person and director of the company, are filed with the stock exchanges. The respondent also informed that information about any enforcement action taken by SEBI, is available in the public domain on the SEBI website. The respondent also provided the link for accessing the SEBI website.
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 has furnished misleading information as all companies/corporate houses are required to report violation or suspected violation to SEBI under the SEBI (PIT) Regulations, 2015. Further, SEBI may make enquiries against any person who is found to have violated any provisions of the said regulations. The appellant also submitted that the respondent has failed to forward the application to Stock Exchanges under the RTI Act.

5. I have perused the queries and the response provided thereto. With respect to query numbers 3(i) and 3(ii), I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the queries by providing the information available with him regarding disclosures made to Stock Exchanges under Section 7(2) of the SEBI (PIT) Regulations, 2015. Further, I note that such disclosures are available on the website of the Stock Exchanges, which is in the public domain. In this regard, I note that the Hon'ble CIC, in its order no. CIC/AT/A/2010/000384 has held that "*A matter already brought out into the public domain either through website or through a publication, comes within the obligation cast on the public authority u/s 4(1) of the RTI Act and it would be entirely in order for that public authority to direct a petitioner to the source from where information could be obtained.*" The said observation was also relied upon by the Hon'ble CIC, in the matter of *Shri Mrigesh Manubhai Thakkar, Patan vs. SEBI* (order dated December 28, 2016), while upholding the decision of the FAA, SEBI. In view of these observations, I do not find any deficiency in the response. In light of the fact that the disclosures made to Stock Exchanges under Section 7(2) of the SEBI (PIT) Regulations, 2015, are already available in the public domain, I do not find any merit in the submission of the appellant regarding failure of the respondent to forward the application to the Stock Exchanges.
6. With respect to the query number 3(iii), I note that information regarding any regulatory action taken by SEBI would be available on the website of SEBI. In view of the same, I find that the query has been adequately addressed and I do not find any deficiency in the response.
7. Further, the appellant, in his appeal, *inter alia*, alleged violation of SEBI Regulations by certain entities. In my opinion, if the appellant has any grievance, he may approach the correct grievance redressal forum. I note that redressal of grievance does not fall within the ambit of the RTI Act. Similar observations were made by the Hon'ble CIC in the matter of *Sh. Triveni Prasad Babuguna vs. LIC of India, Lucknow* (Decision dated September 6, 2012). In view of these observations, I find that the submissions of the appellant do not warrant consideration at this stage.

8. 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: June 01, 2022

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