

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

Appeal No. 6950 of 2026

Rajeev Ranjan Singh : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated March 07, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated April 02, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated June 29, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00236).
2. I note that under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, an aggrieved person may prefer the first appeal within thirty days from the receipt of the response from the CPIO of the concerned public authority. In the instant case, the impugned response from the respondent is dated April 02, 2026. The appellant, therefore, should have filed the first appeal on or before expiry of thirty days from the date of receipt of the said response. As noted above, the appellant’s first appeal was received on June 29, 2026. The first appeal has been made after the last date permissible under the RTI Act. The appellant neither made a request for condoning the said delay in filing the appeal nor made any submission explaining the reasons which caused the delay. Considering the absence of a request for condoning the delay and any valid reason that prevented the appellant from filing the appeal in time, I consider this appeal as time barred and hence, liable to be dismissed on that count.
3. Notwithstanding the above observation, I am considering the appeal on merit. I have perused the application and the appeal and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record.

4. **Queries in the application** - The appellant, in his application dated March 07, 2026, sought the following information:

“I request the following information regarding demat accounts maintained through depositories in India.

Information Requested

The total number of Demat Accounts opened in Kanpur (Uttar Pradesh) & Varanasi (Uttar Pradesh)

The total value of securities / assets held in Demat Accounts (Assets under Custody / AUC) belonging to investors residing in Kanpur & Varanasi.

Year-wise breakup for the last five financial years (FY 2020-21 to FY 2024-25 or latest available) for:

Number of Demat Accounts

Total value of assets held in Demat Accounts

Separate data, if available, for accounts maintained through

National Securities Depository Limited

Central Depository Services Limited

If city-wise data is not maintained, kindly provide the nearest available classification such as district-wise or pin code-wise statistics for Kanpur and Varanasi.

Any official reports, internal studies or statistical summaries prepared by SEBI regarding investor participation or Demat account penetration in these two cities.”

5. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the information sought is not maintained by SEBI in normal course of regulation of securities market. Hence, the same is not available with SEBI. Further, the respondent informed that the data regarding Demat Accounts are publicly available on the websites of CDSL and NSDL.
6. **Ground of appeal** – On perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response of the respondent.

7. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I note that the respondent has categorically stated that the requested information is not maintained by SEBI in normal course of regulation of securities market. Hence, the requested information 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 Supreme Court of India in *Central Board of Secondary Education & Anr. vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay & Ors* (Judgment dated August 9, 2011) held that *"The RTI Act provides access to all information that is available and existing. This is clear from a combined reading of section 3 and the definitions of 'information' and 'right to information' under clauses (f) and (j) of section 2 of the Act. If a public authority has any information in the form of data or analysed data, or abstracts, or statistics, an applicant may access such information, subject to the exemptions in section 8 of the Act. But where the information sought is not a part of the record of a public authority, and where such information is not required to be maintained under any law or the rules or regulations of the public authority, the Act does not cast an obligation upon the public authority, to collect or collate such non-available information and then furnish it to an applicant."* Further, I note that the Hon'ble Central Information Commission in the matter of *Lakshminarayanan R vs. SEBI* (order dated February 09, 2023) observed that *"Keeping in view the facts of the case, the Commission observed that the information sought by the appellant regarding Central Depository Services Ltd. was not maintained by the respondent authority in the normal course of regulation of securities market. It is an established law that the information sought for in order to be disclosable under the RTI Act, 2005 must be existent and available in the records..... In the instant case, the desired information was not available in the records of the respondent authority..."*. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of respondent.
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: July 28, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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