

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

Appeal No. 5420 of 2022

Girish Verma	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated August 11, 2022 (received by SEBI on August 17, 2022) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated September 05, 2022, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated September 15, 2022 (received by the Office of Appellate Authority on September 20, 2022). 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 August 11, 2022, made reference to certain letters and emails sent by SEBI and other entities and sought the following information:

“Provide the information, company name of Ref. No. 20210400308 from Bombay Stock Exchange, status of shares to its quantity, name of shareholder and its dividend amount payment status to the name of shareholder by Link Intime India Pvt. Ltd.”
3. The respondent, in response to the aforesaid query, informed that the query is vague and not specific and accordingly, the same cannot be construed as seeking “information”, as defined under section 2(f) of the RTI Act.
4. **Ground of appeal-** The appellant has not mentioned any specific ground for filing the appeal. The appellant, in his appeal, *inter alia*, referred to an email dated April 15, 2021 sent by Castrol India Investor Services Department to SEBI and sought the justified and authentic reply sent with respect to the said email.
5. I have perused the query raised by the appellant. I find that the same is 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.*" In view of the same, I do not find any deficiency in the response.

6. Further, I note that the appellant, in his appeal, *inter alia*, sought the justified and authentic reply sent by SEBI with respect to the email dated April 15, 2021. I find that this query was raised for the first time in this 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 request does 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: October 12, 2022

A SUNIL KUMAR
APPELLATE AUTHORITY UNDER THE RTI ACT
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA