

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

Appeal No. 5834 of 2023

Sivakavi A	:	Appellant
Vs		
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated September 30, 2023 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as “**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated October 12, 2023 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/23/00221) dated October 13, 2023. 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. **Requests in the application** - The appellant, vide his application dated September 30, 2023 sought following information:

“ 1. Provide the information on i have to pay annual maintenance fee AMC for unused demat account.?”

2. Provide all information related to demat account all maintenance and transaction and brokerage fees.

3. How i complaint unregulated demant AMC charges to authority. And provide the address.”

3. **Reply of the Respondent** The respondent in response to the request no. 1 informed that the request is in the nature of seeking guidance/clarification/opinion. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as “information”, as defined u/s 2(f) of the RTI act, 2005. In response to the request nos. 2 and 3, the respondent informed that the query is vague and not clear. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as “information”, as defined u/s 2(f) of the RTI act, 2005. Further, the respondent provided information regarding lodging of grievance, if any, on the SCORES portal of Securities and Exchange Board of India (hereinafter referred to as “**SEBI**”) and tracking the status of the same. The respondent also 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. The appellant was also 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 information provided was incomplete, misleading or false information. The appellant in his appeal has requested to provide him information sought in queries No. 2 and 3 of his application.
5. **Request No. 2** -The appellant vide request no. 2 had sought information viz. *“Provide all information related to demat account all maintenance and transaction and brokerage fees”*. On perusal of the request and the response of the respondent, I concur with the response of the respondent that the said request of the appellant is vague and not specific. In this regard, I note that the Hon’ble CIC in the matter of *Ms. Sarika Jain vs National Hydroelectric Power Corporation Limited* (order dated April 25, 2014) held that *“As regards the first part i.e. copies of all documents in relation to the contracts mentioned in the RTI application, the Commission finds that the term “all” used by the Appellant here is very vague and does not pin point the particular document she wants to obtain from the Respondents. The Appellant is, therefore, advised to be more specific and identify the documents she wants to obtain from the Respondents ...”*
6. **Request No. 3** - The appellant vide request no. 3 had *inter alia* sought information regarding filing of complaint w.r.t. issues pertaining to demat account AMC charges. In this regard, I note that the respondent has appropriately guided the appellant to refer to the SCORES website for lodging his grievance, if any, and also provided helpline service numbers launched by SEBI, to facilitate replies to various queries of the general public on matters relating to securities market. It is understood that SCORES is an online platform designed to help investors to lodge their complaints, pertaining to securities market, online with SEBI against listed companies and SEBI registered intermediaries. In view of the same, I find that the application has been adequately addressed and no further intervention is warranted at this stage.
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: November 8, 2023

B RAJENDRAN

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