

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

Appeal No. 5345 of 2022

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

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated July 11, 2022 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated July 29, 2022 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated August 13, 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, vide his application dated July 11, 2022, *inter alia*, sought status of two complaints filed by him against Meeshika Vishwakarma prop. Sai proficient Research Investment Advisory and GRS Solutions.
3. The respondent, in response to the aforesaid query, provided the complete action history pertaining to the two complaints filed by the appellant. The respondent also informed that SEBI had passed a final order against GRS Solution, proprietor Mr. Nilesh Vispute. Further, the respondent informed that the complaint had been shifted to Regulatory Action Module in SCORES on September 15, 2021 and that the Intermediary has also been advised on February 08, 2022 to resolve all the complaints as per the direction in the Final Order. With respect to the complaint filed against Sai Proficient Research Investment Advisory, the respondent informed regarding the interim and the confirmatory orders dated February 09, 2021 and August 27, 2021, respectively, passed by SEBI. The respondent also informed that the said complaint had been shifted to Regulatory Action Module in SCORES on February 27, 2021. The respondent also provided the links for accessing the said orders in respect of Mr. Nilesh Vispute in the matter of GRS Solution and also in the matter of Sai Proficient Research Investment Advisory.
4. **Ground of appeal-** The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that no response was received within the time limit. The appellant, in his appeal, *inter alia*, submitted that he has not received any reply from SEBI or dealing officer. The appellant also sought refund of the money invested by him.

5. On perusal of the application, I find that the appellant has sought information with respect to status of his complaints filed with SEBI. I note that the respondent has already provided copy of the Action History of the complaints along with information regarding action taken by SEBI against GRS Solution, proprietor Mr. Nilesh Vispute and Sai Proficient Research Investment Advisory. I note that the Action History of the complaints reveal the action taken and the date-wise progress of the complaints. On consideration, I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the application by providing the information available with him. Further, the respondent has guided the appellant to access the relevant information available on the SEBI website. Therefore, I find no deficiency in the respondent's response.
6. I note that the appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that no response was received within the time limit. On perusal of the documents available on record, I note that the application was received by the respondent on July 11, 2022 and the response was issued on July 29, 2022. On consideration, I find that the respondent has provided his reply to the application within the time stipulated under the RTI Act. Accordingly, I do not find any merit in the said submission made by the appellant.
7. Further, on perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant has grievance regarding response not being provided with respect to his complaints. The appellant also sought refund of the money invested by him. In my opinion, if the appellant has any grievance, he may approach the appropriate grievance redressal forum. I note that redressal of grievance does not fall within the ambit of the RTI Act. Similar observations were made by the Hon'ble CIC in the matter of *Sh. Triveni Prasad Babuguma vs. LIC of India, Lucknow* (Decision dated September 6, 2012). In view of these observations, I find that the said submissions of the appellant in his appeal, do not warrant consideration at this stage.
8. 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: September 13, 2022

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