

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

Appeal No. 5042 of 2022

Viswanathan B	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated March 28, 2022 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated April 21, 2022, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated May 12, 2022. 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 March 28, 2022, *inter alia*, alleged that Coimbatore Enterprises and Holdings Limited has not complied with the conditions imposed by SEBI vide Exit order dated April 3, 2013. The appellant also stated that he had asked SEBI to take cognizance of the matter and that he had not received any response to his mail dated October 18, 2021 and subsequent reminders dated December 30, 2021 and February 17, 2022.
3. The respondent, in response to the aforementioned application, informed that erstwhile Coimbatore Stock Exchange is no longer a recognized stock exchange pursuant to order dated April 03, 2013 passed by SEBI. Therefore, erstwhile Coimbatore Stock Exchange is not a regulated entity of SEBI after April 03, 2013. However, the respondent informed regarding the action taken by SEBI with respect to the complaint dated October 18, 2021. The respondent also provided copy of the response dated April 25, 2022 sent by Coimbatore Enterprises and Holdings Limited, after severing the names and designations of SEBI officials since the same is exempt from disclosure under Sections 8(1)(g) and 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act.
4. **Ground of appeal-** The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he is not satisfied with the response provided by the respondent. The appellant, in his appeal, made submissions regarding role of SEBI and the details of alleged violations.

5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. At the outset, I note that the appellant has only made statements regarding his complaint filed with SEBI. Further, he has not specifically sought any information under the RTI Act. Notwithstanding the same, I note that the respondent has provided information regarding action taken with respect to the complaint filed by the appellant. In view of the same, I am of the opinion that the respondent has adequately responded to the application by providing the information available with him. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response.
6. Further, the appellant, in his application and appeal, *inter alia*, has alleged non-compliance of SEBI order dated April 03, 2013. The appellant, in his appeal, also made submissions regarding role of SEBI and the details of alleged violations. In my opinion, if the appellant has any grievance, he may approach the correct grievance redressal forum. I note that redressal of grievance does not fall within the ambit of the RTI Act. Similar observations were made by the Hon'ble CIC in the matter of *Sh. Triveni Prasad Babuguna vs. LIC of India, Lucknow* (Decision dated September 6, 2012). In view of these observations, I find that the submissions of the appellant do not warrant consideration 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: June 09, 2022

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