

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

Appeal No. 6645 of 2025

Gobikrishnan : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated November 12, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated November 26, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00318) dated November 30, 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. **Queries in the application** - The appellant, in his application dated November 12, 2025, sought the following information:

“ 1.I would like to know the information about the action taken on the complaint(DPUBE/E/2025/0000424)which was filed on cpgrams web portal referred to Ms.vandana. (F1 attached).

2.I sent an email (F2 attached) to xxxxx@sebi.gov.in. in my native language (Tamil) under Indian constitution article 350. But I got a response from different email id and also not in my native language which is disobeying the Indian law and it is an offence under Indian penal code section 166 (BNS). I would like to know the information is Ms.Vandana alive or not?

3.If She alive, I would like to know the information about the central government employee to whom I should complain against Ms.(Lazy, Foolish, Violator)Vandana for her irresponsibility.

4.I would like to know the information about the action taken on the complaint unique id:Nov-2025_21_NSE.(F3 attached).

*5.I would like to know the information about the Mediator (F4 attached). Mr.Balasubramaniam Ramachandran
(a)Is he a central government employee?
(b).To whom should I complain against the mediator.”*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to query no.1 in the application, informed that the information with regards to grievance DPUBE/E/2025/0000424 is pertaining to CPGRAMS. The applicant can access the complaint status and Action taken report by logging into CPGRAMS website.

The respondent, in response to query nos. 2 and 3, informed that the information sought is in the nature of grievance and that taking action or resolution of grievance does not come under the provisions of RTI Act. Therefore, it does not qualify as information under provisions of section 2(f) of RTI Act. Further, the respondent informed that complaint handling process in SEBI is a collective process in which different officers at different level contribute. The names of the SEBI Officials and departments are available on SEBI website.

The respondent, in response to query no. 4, informed that the requested information is not available with SEBI. Further, the respondent informed that the suggested norms for MIIs to empanel Conciliators & Arbitrators and the Code of Conduct for the latter are provided in the Master Circular No. SEBI/HO/OIAE/OIAE IAD-1/P/CIR/2023/145 dated July 31, 2023 (updated as on August 11, 2023) which is available on website of SEBI.

4. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. With regard to query no. 1, I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the query by providing the information available to him.
5. With regard to query nos. 2 and 3, I note that same are in the nature of grievance. I find that the said queries cannot be construed as seeking ‘information’ as defined under section 2(f) of RTI Act. In this context, reliance is placed on the matter of *Laxman Prasad Kayal vs. CPIO, State Bank of India* (Order dated June 20, 2023), wherein the Hon’ble Central Information Commission (**CIC**) held that “9. *The Commission based on a perusal of the facts on record finds that the dissatisfaction of the Appellant with the reply provided by the CPIO is bereft of merit as the RTI Application merely seeks for clarifications and answers to interrogative queries. It appears that the Appellant is harbouring a grievance and is not seeking access to information as envisaged under the RTI Act.*” Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.

6. With regard to query no. 4, I note that the respondent has categorically stated that the requested information 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 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.
7. Further, from the perusal of the reply of the respondent, I note that no response has been provided to query no. 5 in the appellant's application.
8. In view of the above observations, I remit the query no. 5 in the application to the respondent for sending appropriate response to the appellant in terms of RTI Act, within 15 working days from the date of receipt of this order.
9. The appeal is accordingly disposed of.

Place: Mumbai

Date: December 23, 2025

RUCHI CHOJER

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