

3) RTAs and cos have misused said circulars and information thereof.

4) Any complaint received and resolution thereof.

5) Mismatch percentage in name mismatch is to be decided by whom.”

4. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to queries in the application, informed that appellant's queries are vague and not specific. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as “information”, as defined u/s 2(f) of the RTI Act.
5. I have perused the queries and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I concur with the response of the respondent that the appellant's queries are vague and 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**”) 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. 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: January 20, 2025

RUCHI CHOJER

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