

in the records of the public authority. In this context, I note that the Hon'ble Central Information Commission in the matter of *Ms. Sarika Jain vs National Hydroelectric Power Corporation Limited* (order dated April 25, 2014) held that *"As regards the first part i.e. copies of all documents in relation to the contracts mentioned in the RTI application, the Commission finds that the term "all" used by the Appellant here is very vague and does not pin point the particular document she wants to obtain from the Respondents. The Appellant is, therefore, advised to be more specific and identify the documents she wants to obtain from the Respondents ..."* Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.

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: May 16, 2024

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