

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

Appeal No. 6528 of 2025

Yeddu Chaitanya Kumar : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated July 30, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated August 22, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00220) dated August 22, 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 July 30, 2025, sought the following information:

“ 1. What steps has SEBI taken or is planning for recovery/ refund to Groupon investors?”

2. Is a nodal officer or refund mechanism set up for claim submission?

3. Are investors required to apply or submit claims formally? If yes, what is the procedure and timeline?

4. Status of action taken against Farm Silo Tech/ ZF Project LLP / Yotta Agro Ventures / Groupon. Kindly treat this as urgent investor grievance under RTI Act, and help me recover my invested funds through lawful channels.

Even I have sent my documents by INDIA speed post to the SEBI on 30th July. The Office of Investor Assistance and Education Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) Plot No.C4-A, G Block, Bandra Kurla Complex, Bandra (East), Mumbai - 400051, Maharashtra”

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to queries in the application, informed that SEBI conducts examinations and investigations confidentially in a holistic manner. The respondent also informed that SEBI neither confirm or deny the existence of any investigation. SEBI conducts investigation to examine alleged or suspected violations of laws and Regulations related to securities market. Post investigation, whenever violations are established, appropriate enforcement actions are taken under the provisions of the SEBI Act, 1992 and Regulations framed there under which culminate in the issuance of Orders. These orders are available in public domain and can be accessed from SEBI website.
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. On consideration, I find that the appellant's queries are in the nature of seeking clarification/opinion/confirmation from the respondent. I find that the said queries 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 opinion or confirmation under 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 Central Information Commission(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/ advices 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. Further, I note that application is in the nature of grievance. I note that redressal of grievance does not come under the purview of the RTI Act. In this context, I note that the Hon'ble CIC, in the matter of *Mr. Surendra Vishwakarma vs. President Secretariat* (Order dated April 29, 2016) observed that *"In this context, we note that the RTI Act cannot be used to make the respondent to do certain things or take certain action for the reason that the Act is not the proper law for redressal of grievances/ disputes and there are other appropriate forum(s) for resolving such*

matters.” In view of the same, I find that the application has been adequately addressed and no further intervention is warranted at this stage.

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: September 19, 2025

RUCHI CHOJER

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