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

Appeal No. 6345 of 2025

Smt. Pitima Sahu	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated February 13, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 ("**RTI Act**"). The respondent, by a letter dated March 11, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00059) dated March 20, 2025. 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. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that the information provided is incomplete, misleading or false information. The appellant in her appeal has raised dispute only with respect to response to query nos. 2(a), 2(b) and 6(b) in the application.

3. **Query nos. 2(a) & 2(b) in the application** - The appellant, vide the aforesaid queries in the application, sought the following information:

   Recovery Proceedings Status:

   Query no. 2(a)*: Provide a step-by-step breakdown of recovery actions after 22.10.2018 Attachment Proceedings No. 4053 & 4054 of 2018, Certificate No. 1769 of 2018.*

   Query no. 2(b): *Mention the dates, type of proceedings, authority involved, and outcomes over the past 7 years since the 22.10.2018 order.*

4. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to query nos. 2(a) & 2(b) informed that the matter is pending before Chhattisgarh PID Court, Rajnandgaon.

5. I have perused the queries and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the queries by providing the information available with him. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.

6. **Query no. 6(b) :** The appellant, vide the aforesaid query in the application, sought the following information:

"*Provide a copy of the property details submitted by Anmol India as per SEBI 09.03.2015 order Para 4.1*"

7. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to query no. 6 (b), informed that the information sought is not available with SEBI.

8. I have perused the query and the response provided thereto. The respondent, in his response to query no. 6 (b), has categorically mentioned that 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 CIC in the matter of *Sh. Pattipati Rama Murthy vs. CPIO, SEBI* (Decision dated July 8, 2013), held: "… *if it (SEBI) does not have any such information in its possession, the CPIO cannot obviously invent one for the benefit of the Appellant. There is simply no information to be given*". Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.

9. I note that the appellant, in her appeal, has challenged the correctness of the response of the respondent to query no. 6(b). In this context, it is observed that the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in *Narendra Tyagi vs. Assistant Director (CPIO)* (Decision dated December 06, 2023) has held: "*it is clear that dispute as regards the correctness of information provided under the RTI Act, or any other dispute or controversy, cannot be adjudicated in proceedings under the RTI Act. The CPIO is only required to supply all the information/documents within his access. Whether or not such information as provided by the CPIO under the RTI Act is incorrect in any manner, is not the domain of consideration or determination under the RTI proceedings.*" In view of the aforesaid observation, I find that the said submission of the appellant does not warrant consideration at this stage.

10. Further, I note that the appellant in her appeal has sought further information pertaining to her appeal. As held by the Hon'ble CIC in *Harish Prasad Divedi vs. Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited* (decided on January 28, 2014), an information seeker cannot be allowed to expand the scope of his RTI enquiry at appeal stage. Accordingly, I find that the said submissions do not warrant consideration at this stage.

11. 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: April 08, 2025

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