

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

Appeal No. 6327 of 2025

Grish Verma : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated January 31, 2025 (received by SEBI on February 03, 2025) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated February 13, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated February 22, 2025 (received by the Office of Appellate Authority on March 04, 2025). I have perused the application, the response of the respondent 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 January 31, 2025, has sought the following information:
 1. *What is the folio no. of non-redemption of debentures to company no. 021359 as Indrol Lubricants and Specialities Ltd. to mode of amount Rs. 2,66,336/- since sometimes Nov. 1995?*
 2. *What is the folio no. of shares to British Petroleum Company sometimes November 2002?*
 3. *What is the total amount to dividend amount of shares to British Petroleum Company since sometimes Nov. 2002?*
 4. *When I will get the total dividend amount by cheque or transfer to my IDBI Bank Saving A/c No. XXXXXXXXXXXX11, IFSC Code: IBK:XXXXXXXX75, Motihari Branch, Customer ID : XXXXXX9 Email Id: of IDBI Bank Motihari Branch: ibkl0001075@idbi.co.in, since sometimes November 2002 from British Petroleum company ?*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to the query nos. 1 to 3 in the application, informed that the information sought by the appellant is not maintained by SEBI in normal course of regulation of securities market. Hence, the same is not available with SEBI.

The respondent, in response to query no. 4, informed that the appellant's query is in the nature of seeking clarification/opinion. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as "Information" as defined u/s 2(f) of the RTI Act.

4. **Ground of appeal**- On perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response provided by the respondent.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. With respect to query nos. 1 to 3 in the application, 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 and hence, the same 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 Central Information Commission (hereinafter referred to as "**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.
6. With regard to query no. 4, I agree with the response of the respondent that the query is in the nature of seeking clarification/opinion from the respondent. I find that the said query cannot be construed as seeking 'information' as defined under section 2(f) of the RTI Act. Consequently, the respondent did not have an obligation to provide such clarification or opinion under the RTI Act. In this context, reliance is placed on the matter of *Azad Singh vs. CPIO, Oriental Insurance Company Limited* (order dated March 23, 2021), wherein, Hon'ble CIC observed that "7. The Commission, after hearing the submissions of both the parties and after perusal of records, observed that some queries of the appellant are in the nature of seeking explanation/ opinion/ advice/ confirmation/ clarification from the CPIO and he has expected that the CPIO firstly should analyze the documents and then provide information to the appellant. But the CPIO is not supposed to create information; or to interpret information; or to compile information as per the desire of the appellant under the ambit of the RTI Act. As per Section 2(f) of the RTI Act, the reasons/ opinions/ advices can only be provided to the applicants if it is available on record of the public authority. The CPIO cannot create information in the manner as sought by the appellant. The CPIO

is only a communicator of information based on the records held in the office and hence, he cannot be expected to do research work to deduce anything from the material therein and then supply it to him.” Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.

7. Further, I note from the perusal of appeal that appellant is seeking redressal of certain grievance through his RTI application. I note that the redressal of grievance does not come under the purview of the RTI Act. In this context, I note that the Hon’ble CIC, in the matter of *Mr. Surendra Vishwakarma vs. President Secretariat* (Order dated April 29, 2016) observed that *“In this context, we note that the RTI Act cannot be used to make the respondent to do certain things or take certain action for the reason that the Act is not the proper law for redressal of grievances/ disputes and there are other appropriate forum(s) for resolving such matters.”*
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: March 27, 2025

RUCHI CHOJER

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