

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

**Appeal No. 5206 of 2022**

|                          |    |            |
|--------------------------|----|------------|
| Vijaykumar Vasudev Ankam | :  | Appellant  |
|                          | Vs |            |
| CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai       | :  | Respondent |

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application dated May 23, 2022 (received by SEBI on May 25, 2022) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated June 23, 2022, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated July 14, 2022 (received by the Office of Appellate Authority on July 19, 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, vide point numbers 3(i) to 3(v) of his application, made certain statements regarding the letters dated September 14, 2021 and October 19, 2021 issued by SBI and SBI Mutual Fund Management Ltd. (respectively). Vide point number 3(vi), the appellant, *inter alia*, sought information regarding where his money is being spent by SBI. The appellant also referred to the 63% share of SBI mentioned in the letter dated October 19, 2021 and sought information regarding whether it is for the name, or is it for profit or anything else. The appellant also questioned the transparency in SBI Mutual Funds Management Ltd.
3. The respondent, in response to the point numbers 3(i) to 3(v), informed that no information has been sought. With respect to point number 3(vi), the respondent informed that the information sought does not pertain to SEBI.
4. **Ground of appeal-** On perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response provided by the respondent. The appellant, in his appeal, *inter alia*, submitted that SEBI should take the information regarding the letters and give it to the investor. The appellant also made certain allegations against SBI Mutual Fund.

5. **Point numbers 3(i) to 3(v)-** I have perused queries and I find that the same are statements made by the appellant regarding the letters dated September 14, 2021 and October 19, 2021 issued by SBI and SBI Mutual Fund respectively. I agree with the response of the respondent that no information has been sought by the appellant.
6. **Point number 3(vi)-** I have perused the queries raised at point number 3(vi) and the response provided thereto. I note that the appellant has raised certain queries specifically with respect to the said letters dated September 14, 2021 and October 19, 2021. On consideration, I find that that the queries are in the nature of seeking clarification/opinion of the respondent with respect to the statements made by SBI and SBI Mutual Fund Management Ltd. in their respective letters. I note that the respondent is not supposed to create information; or to interpret information; or to compile information as per the desire of the appellant under the ambit of the RTI Act. In this context, reliance is placed on matter of *Azad Singh vs. CPIO, Oriental Insurance Company Limited* (order dated March 23, 2021) wherein Hon'ble CIC observed that “7. *The Commission, after hearing the submissions of both the parties and after perusal of records, observed that some queries of the appellant are in the nature of seeking explanation/opinion/advice/confirmation/clarification from the CPIO and he has expected that the CPIO firstly should analyze the documents and then provide information to the appellant. But the CPIO is not supposed to create information; or to interpret information; or to compile information as per the desire of the appellant under the ambit of the RTI Act. As per Section 2(f) of the RTI Act, the reasons/opinions/advice can only be provided to the applicants if it is available on record of the public authority. The CPIO cannot create information in the manner as sought by the appellant. The CPIO is only a communicator of information based on the records held in the office and hence, he cannot be expected to do research work to deduce anything from the material therein and then supply it to him.*” In view of these observations, I find that the said queries cannot be construed as seeking ‘information’ as defined under section 2 (f) of the RTI Act. Accordingly, no further intervention of this forum is warranted.
7. Further, on perusal of the application and the appeal, it appears that the appellant has grievance regarding utilization of his money invested with SBI/SBI Mutual Fund. 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 Babuguna vs. LIC of India, Lucknow* (Decision dated September 6, 2012). In view of these observations, I find that the 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: August 12, 2022**

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