

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

Appeal No. 6608 of 2025

Vivend Joarg francis : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated September 17, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated October 16, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00287) dated November 02, 2025. 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, in his application dated October 17, 2025, sought the following information:

“ 01) to give detailed information on the rules, time and conditions of the policy for refund of the deposit amount of the account holders by sahara india company ?

02) to give detailed information on the rules and time limits of the policy for refund of the deposit amount of the account holders by pulse india finance company ?”
3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to query no. 1 in the application provided information with reference to proceedings in two of the Group Companies of Sahara Group namely Sahara India Real Estate Corporation Limited, (SIRECL) and Sahara Housing Investment Corporation Limited (SHICL) which are being handled by SEBI.

The respondent, in response to query no. 2, informed that the information sought does not pertain to SEBI.

4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was provided incomplete, misleading or false information.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. With respect to query no.1, I find that the respondent has provided the information available with him. In this context, I note that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in *Central Board of Secondary Education & Anr. vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay & Ors* (Judgment dated August 9, 2011) held that *"The RTI Act provides access to all information that is available and existing. This is clear from a combined reading of section 3 and the definitions of 'information' and 'right to information' under clauses (f) and (j) of section 2 of the Act."* Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
6. Further, with respect to query no. 2, I note that the respondent has clearly informed that the information sought does not pertain to SEBI. Hence, I find that the requested information is not available with SEBI. I note that the respondent can only provide information that is available in the records. In this regard, I note that the Hon'ble Central Information Commission in the matter of *Sh. Pattipati Rama Murthy vs. CPIO, SEBI* (Decision dated July 8, 2013), held: *"... if it (SEBI) does not have any such information in its possession, the CPIO cannot obviously invent one for the benefit of the Appellant. There is simply no information to be given."* Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
7. 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: November 28, 2025

RUCHI CHOJER

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