

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

Appeal No. 6245 of 2024

Prerit Kailash Misra	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated November 20, 2024 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated December 05, 2024, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/24/00287) dated December 06, 2024. 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. **Query in the application** - The appellant, vide his application dated November 20, 2024, sought the following information:

“SEBI has stated in a Reply to a Complaint PMOPG/E/2022/0120xxxx, Dt 19/05/2022 (same attached), with the Subject: DOEAF & DEACM complaints ...in the matter of Varun Resources Limited (VRL) and Varun Global Limited (VGL)- that SEBI met with Officials of the above mentioned Companies VRL and VGL . On what Date was this Meeting held.”
3. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to the application, informed that appellant’s query is not clear and specific. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as “information”, as defined u/s 2(f) of the RTI Act.
4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he has been refused access to the information requested.

5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. I note that the appellant, in his application has referred to a complaint, but has not provided a clear complaint reference number. I also note that even though appellant in his application has asserted that there has been meeting between SEBI and officials of VRL and VGL, there is no reference to any such meeting in the attachment enclosed along with his application. Hence, I concur with the response of the respondent that the request is vague and not clear. 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. I, further, note that similar requests were sought by the appellant in his earlier RTI applications (Reg. no. SEBIH/R/E/24/01290 dated October 10, 2024, Reg. no. SEBIH/R/E/24/01077 dated August 30, 2024, Reg. no. SEBIH/R/E/24/00937 dated August 02, 2024). The aforementioned requests were also denied by the appellant vide his replies dated October 21, 2024, September 10, 2024 and August 09, 2024 respectively, for being vague. Further, FAA orders dated November 19, 2024, October 08, 2024 and August 29, 2024 were also passed with respect to the earlier RTI applications. Therefore, I find the appellant's appeals to be repetitive in nature.
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: December 30, 2024

RUCHI CHOJER

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