

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

Appeal No. 5078 of 2022

Geeta Khattar	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated May 02, 2022 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated May 30, 2022 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated May 31, 2022, against the said response dated May 30, 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. **Ground of appeal-** The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that information provided was incomplete, misleading or false information. The appellant, in her appeal, *inter alia*, submitted that SEBI is bound to give the requested information. In view of the submission made by the appellant, I am dealing with the queries and the response provided thereto, in the following paragraphs.
3. **Query numbers 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7B-** The appellant, vide query numbers 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7B, *inter alia*, sought various details pertaining to the copy of letter Ref No. KS/COMPLIANCE/NSE/CORR/2016-17/RB/081 forwarded by SEBI.
4. The respondent, in response to the aforesaid queries, informed that the queries are in the nature of seeking clarification/opinion and accordingly, the same cannot be construed as seeking “information”, as defined under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act, 2005. However, the respondent informed that the letter referred to by the appellant, was shared earlier in reply to her SCORES complaints. The respondent also provided details of the SCORES complaint.
5. I have perused the queries and I agree with the observation of the respondent that the same are in the nature of seeking clarification and opinion. I also note that the respondent has provided information

available with him regarding sharing of the said letter. In view of the same, I do not find any deficiency in the response.

6. **Query number 5-** The appellant, vide query number 5, sought the following information-

“5/ Please , either , provide a copy as proof where SEBI's CPIO and Appellate, RTI have been provided a copy of the letter ref. no. KS/COMPLIANCE/NSE/CORR/2016- 17/RB/081 on the RTI portal ,, OR ,, provide a copy of the letter ref. no. KS/COMPLIANCE/NSE/CORR/2016- 17/RB/081 here on the RTI portal.”

7. The respondent, in response to the aforesaid query, informed that the appellant may refer to CPIO letter dated April 20, 2022 provided in response to her RTI Application dated March 30, 2022.
8. I have perused the query and the response provided thereto. I note that the respondent has referred to his letter dated April 20, 2022 vide which the appellant was provided the relevant information. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response.
9. **Query numbers 6, 7A and 8-** The appellant, vide query number 6, sought details of subject under which CPIO and Appellate Authority take action on the RTI Portal. Vide query number 7A, the appellant sought the details of the subject under which SEBI's case/complaint dealing officer takes action on SCORES. Vide query number 8, appellant sought relevant details and supporting documents that can be obtained under the Securities Act on SCORES and CPGRAMS portals.
10. The respondent, in response to the aforesaid queries, informed that the queries are vague and not specific and accordingly, the same cannot be construed as seeking “information”, as defined under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act.
11. I have perused the queries raised by the appellant. I find that the same are vague and not specific. Further, it is difficult to ascertain what exact information has been sought by the appellant. In this context, I note that in the matter of *Sbri 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 view of these observations, I do not find any deficiency in the response.

12. **Query number 9-** The appellant sought the details of Government Online portal names where SEBI provides certified copies containing SEBI's official seal/stamp.
13. In response to the aforesaid query, the appellant referred to the Circular dated April 4, 2019 issued by SEBI on "Issue of Certified copies of Orders and Circulars", which is available on the SEBI website.
14. On perusal of query number 9 and the response provided thereto, I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the query by providing the information available with him. Accordingly, no further intervention is warranted.
15. **Query number 10-** The appellant, vide query number 10, sought information regarding SEBI weblink/ website where updated version of RTI Guidelines is available. In response to the said query, the respondent advised the appellant to refer to the RTI Act.
16. I have perused the query and I find that the same is in the nature of seeking clarification and the same cannot be construed as seeking "information" under the RTI Act. Accordingly, no further intervention is warranted.
17. 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

ANAND BAIWAR

Date: June 29, 2022

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