

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

Appeal No. 4837 of 2022

Manish Agarwal	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated February 23, 2022 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated March 21, 2022 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated March 22, 2022, against the said response dated March 21, 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. **Queries in the application** –The appellant, in his application dated February 23, 2022, *inter alia*, alleged cheating and breach of trust against Bodhtree Consulting Limited. The appellant sought information as to where such complaints can be lodged. The appellant also stated that he had not found any option to register for violation of the Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements under SCORES.
3. The respondent, in response to the query, informed that the query is 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. However, the respondent guided the appellant to refer to the SCORES FAQ’s on complaints that fall under the purview of SEBI. The respondent also provided the link for accessing the said FAQs. Further, the respondent provided information along with copy of the Action History pertaining to the above mentioned complaint filed by the appellant on SCORES.
4. **Ground of appeal**- The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that the information provided was incomplete, misleading or false. The appellant, in his appeal, reiterated the query raised in his application.
5. I have perused the query and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the query by providing the information regarding the SCORES

FAQs pertaining to complaints. I note that the respondent has also guided the appellant to access the same. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response.

6. Further, I note that the appellant, in his application, stated that he had not found any option to register for violation of the Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements under SCORES. On perusal, the said statement appears to be in the nature of grievance. I note that the Hon'ble CIC, in the matter of *Sh. Triveni Prasad Bahuguna vs. LIC of India, Lucknow* (Decision dated September 6, 2012), held: "*The Appellant is informed that ... redressal of grievance does not fall within the ambit of the RTI Act rather it is up to the Appellant to approach the correct grievance redressal forum...*". In view of these observations, I find that if the appellant has any grievance, the remedy for the same would not lie under the provisions of the RTI Act.
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: April 19, 2022

ANAND BAIWAR

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