

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

Appeal No. 6373 of 2025

Anil Kumar Dubey : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated April 06, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated April 29, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00082) dated May 02, 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. **Query in the application** - The appellant, in his application dated April 06, 2025, sought the following information:

“Please share the steps taken by the Securities & Exchange Board of India against the East Coast Steel Limited on the complaint filed by Mr. Suresh Kumar Jalan, Shareholder of the East Coast Steel.”
3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the query is not specific. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as “information”, as defined u/s 2(f) of the RTI Act. The respondent also informed that the information is sought on a complaint which does not pertain to the appellant.
4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was refused access to the information requested.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. I note that the appellant, in his application has referred to a complaint, but has not provided any specifics such as date of the complaint

and the name of addressee. Hence, I concur with the response of the respondent that the query is not specific. It is an established law that the information sought for in order to be disclosable under the RTI Act, must be clear, specific and available in the records of the public authority. In this context, I note that in the matter of *Mr. T. V. Sundaresan vs. CPIO, Securities and Exchange Board of India* (Decision dated November 24, 2021), the Hon'ble Central Information Commission (hereinafter referred to as "**CIC**") has held: *"The framework of the RTI Act, 2005 expects that the information sought is specific and believed to be existing with the public authority in documented or material form as such; which can be shared with the appellant as per the provisions of the RTI Act. Answering to broad, multiple and general queries and presumptive documents that should have been generated as per the expectation of the appellant cannot be furnished under the provisions of the Act."* Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response.

6. Additionally, I note from the application that the information sought by the appellant relates to a complaint filed by one Mr. Suresh Kumar Jalan and hence, I find that the information sought by the appellant does not pertain to him. In this context, I note that in the matter of *Chandrakant Kantilal Patel vs. CPIO, SEBI* (order dated December 27, 2022), wherein copies of complaints filed against Aakruti Nirmiti Ltd were sought, the Hon'ble CIC has held as under:

"Firstly, the RTI application clearly reveals that the information sought is related to a third party as defined u/s 2(n) of the RTI Act. Sec 2 (n) states that "third party" means a person other than the citizen making a request for information and includes a public authority.

Therefore, the complainants who filed complaints against Aakruti Nirmiti Limited (ANL), and the SEBI all are third parties in this case.

..... appellant cannot insist on getting the information sought by taking the aid of the RTI Act when clearly he was not the complainant in this case."

Further, appellant has not filed any letter of authorisation from Mr. Suresh Kumar Jalan. In the absence of any authorisation letter from Mr. Suresh Kumar Jalan, the appellant clearly is a third party.

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: May 23, 2025

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