

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

Appeal No. 6189 of 2024

Lokesh H K	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated October 04, 2024 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated October 04, 2024 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/24/00242) dated October 04, 2024. 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. **Request in the application** - The appellant, vide his application dated October 04, 2024, sought the following information

“...I'm seeking the information about when I should be getting back my funds of 50 Lakhs from the frozen account and whether only the 50 Lakhs are expected to be returned or with the standard interest rate as per RBI regulations. Please clarify”
3. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to the application informed that the request of the appellant is in the nature of seeking clarification/opinion. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as “information” as defined u/s 2(f) of the RTI Act.
4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he has been refused access to information requested.
5. I have perused the aforesaid request and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I concur with the response of the respondent that the information sought is in the nature of seeking clarification from the respondent. It is understood that the respondent is not supposed to create information; or to interpret information; or to furnish clarification to the appellant under the ambit of the RTI Act. I find that the said

request cannot be construed as seeking 'information' as defined under section 2(f) of the RTI Act. Consequently, the respondent did not have an obligation to provide such clarification or explanation under the RTI Act. In this context, reliance is placed on the matter of *Azad Singh vs. CPIO, Oriental Insurance Company Limited* (order dated March 23, 2021), wherein, Hon'ble Central Information Commission (hereinafter referred to as "**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". 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: October 29, 2024

RUCHI CHOJER

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