

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

Appeal No. 6336 of 2025

Prasenjit Bose : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated January 27, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated February 17, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00050) dated March 12, 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 January 27, 2025, sought the following information:
 - I. “The date of commencement of investigations into Adani group companies by SEBI.
 - II. The number of investigations completed by SEBI till January 2025 and the dates on which they were completed.
 - III. The number of investigations completed by SEBI pursuant to the Supreme Court order dated 03.01.2024 in the matter of *Vishal Timari v. Union of India & Ors.*
 - IV. The nature of actions undertaken by SEBI on the basis of the completed Investigation Reports, with dates, if any.
 - V. Details of information disclosed to securities market participants and the general public regarding the actions initiated by SEBI, if undertaken.
 - VI. The protocol/procedure followed by SEBI vis-a-vis public disclosure of its Investigation Reports.”
3. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to query nos. I, II & IV in the application, informed that the information sought by the appellant is vague and not specific. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as “Information”, as defined u/s 2(f) of the RTI Act.

The respondent, in response to query no. III, informed that the number of investigation completed by SEBI during the year are published in the Annual Report of SEBI and can be accessed from SEBI website.

The respondent, in response to query no. V, informed that the details of action taken by SEBI during the year are published in the Annual Report of SEBI and can be accessed from SEBI website.

The respondent, in response to query no. VI, informed that post investigation, whenever violations are established, appropriate enforcement actions are taken under the provisions of the SEBI Act, 1992 and Regulations framed thereunder which culminate in the issuance of Orders. These Orders are available in public domain and can be accessed from SEBI website.

4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was refused access to the information requested.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. With respect to query nos. I, II & IV in the application, I agree with the response of the respondent that the queries are vague, broad and not specific. It is an established law that the information sought for in order to be disclosable under the RTI Act, must be clear, specific and available in the records of the public authority. In this context, I note that in the matter of *Mr. T. V. Sundaresan vs. CPIO, Securities and Exchange Board of India* (Decision dated November 24, 2021), the Hon'ble Central Information Commission (hereinafter referred to as “CIC”) held: *“The framework of the RTI Act, 2005 expects that the information sought is specific and believed to be existing with the public authority in documented or material form as such; which can be shared with the appellant as per the provisions of the RTI Act. Answering to broad, multiple and general queries and presumptive documents that should have been generated as per the expectation of the appellant cannot be furnished under the provisions of the Act.”* Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.

6. With respect to query nos. III, V and VI, I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the queries by providing the information available with him. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
7. Further, I note that the appellant in his appeal has tried to explain and clarify his queries. I am of the view that the appellant should have made clear and specific queries in his initial application instead of offering clarifications at the appellate stage. As held by the Hon'ble CIC in *Harish Prasad Divedi vs. Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited* (decided on January 28, 2014), an information seeker cannot be allowed to expand the scope of his RTI enquiry at appeal stage. Accordingly, I find that the said submissions 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: April 07, 2025

RUCHI CHOJER

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