

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

Appeal No. 6314 of 2025

Vrinda Vaswani : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated January 06, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated January 17, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00030) dated February 01, 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 her application dated January 06, 2025, sought the following information:

“ 1. My father Late Shri. Shyam Malharrao Gurjar died intestate on 16th November 2013. His PAN Number was AAZPG2756Q.

2. I am one of the legal heirs of my deceased father, true copy of the Order of the Honorable of Legal Heirship Certificate is also attached.

3. I want to know the details of DEMAT accounts of my deceased father - statement of shares, stocks, mutual funds, etc. held by him during his lifetime.

4. Who were the nominee/s to these shares/stocks/mutual funds, etc.?

5. Whether the shares/stocks/mutual funds, etc. were transmitted to any nominee/s or other legal heirs?

6. If yes, date of transmission of shares/stocks/mutual funds, etc.”

3. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to query nos. 1 and 2 in the application, informed that no information was sought by the appellant. The respondent, in response to query nos. 3 to 6, informed that the information sought by the appellant is not maintained by SEBI in normal course of regulation of securities market. Hence, the same is not available with SEBI.
4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant, in her appeal, has submitted that she was refused access to the information requested.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I note that the respondent in his response has categorically stated that the information sought is not available with SEBI. I note that the respondent can only provide information that is available in the records. In this context, I note that the Hon'ble Central Information Commission (hereinafter referred to as “**CIC**”), in the matter of *Sh. Pattipati Rama Murthy vs. CPIO, SEBI* (Decision dated July 8, 2013), held: “... *if it (SEBI) does not have any such information in its possession, the CPIO cannot obviously invent one for the benefit of the Appellant. There is simply no information to be given.*”. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
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: February 25, 2025

RUCHI CHOJER

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