

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

Appeal No. 2771 of 2017

Romy Jaipuria	:	Appellant
	Vs.	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant filed an application dated August 1, 2017, under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent vide letter dated August 18, 2017, responded to the appellant. The appellant filed this appeal dated August 22, 2017, against the said response. 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. From the appeal, I note the appellant is aggrieved by the respondent’s response to his application.
- 3.1 In this appeal, the appellant has *inter alia* submitted: “CPIO intentionally making reference to old RTI reply ... I just want from him any information with regard to my application as available or not with his office. My lord pass speaking order...”
- 3.2 In his response, I note the respondent informed the appellant that reply to similar RTI applications filed by him, was provided vide respondent’s letter no. CPIO/JS/SK/670; 704; 705; 706; 709–2017/14659 dated June 23, 2017. From the material available on record, I note that the aforesaid response dated June 23, 2017, was made by the respondent to an RTI application dated June 21, 2017, as filed by the appellant, which is similar to the application dated August 1, 2017 (which is under consideration in the instant appeal).
- 3.3 Upon a perusal of the queries contained in the appellant’s application dated August 1, 2017, I find that the request for information made therein was vague and not specific. In this context, I note that in the matter of *Shri S. C. Sharma vs. CPIO, Securities and Exchange Board of India* (Decision dated August 30, 2012), the Hon’ble CIC held: “Since the Appellant had not clearly stated what exact information he wanted, the CPIO could not have provided any specific information to him.

We would like to advise the Appellant that he might like to specify the exact information he wants from the SEBI and prefer a fresh application before the CPIO.” In addition, I note that in the matter of Mrs. Bina Saha vs. CPIO, Securities and Exchange Board of India (Decision dated November 6, 2012), the Hon’ble CIC held: “It must be remembered that Section 2(f) of the RTI Act defines information as a material or virtual record. The citizen has every right to get copies of such records held by any public authority including the SEBI. However, in order to get the copies of such records, the information seeker has to specify the details of the records she wants. In fact, section 6(1) of the RTI Act very clearly states that the information seeker has to specify the particulars of the information sought by him or her.” In view of these observations, I find that the respondent is not obliged to provide a response where the information sought is not clear or specific. However, if the appellant still wishes to get information, he may prefer a fresh application before the respondent specifying clearly the exact information he wants from SEBI.

- 3.4 Without prejudice to the foregoing, in his response dated June 23, 2017, I note the respondent informed the appellant to refer to the SEBI website i.e. www.sebi.gov.in under the heads: **Legal** for SEBI Act, Rules, Regulations and Circulars and **Enforcement** for any enforcement action taken/Orders passed by SEBI. Upon a consideration of the aforementioned, I find that the requisite information in respect of the appellant’s request for information was provided by the respondent.
4. I find that there is no need to interfere with the decision of the respondent. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Place: Mumbai

Date: September 11, 2017

**G. MAHALINGAM
APPELLATE AUTHORITY
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA**