

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

Appeal No. 6405 of 2025

Minati Swain : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated May 02, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated May 22, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00107) dated May 27, 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. **Query in the application** - The appellant, in her application dated May 02, 2025, sought the following information:

“ 1. My Abode Bonds out of six, five each amounting Rs 26100/- and one Abode Bond amounting Rs 14400/-,total Bonds of Rs 1,44,900/- dated 26 May 2012, copy of applications of first page attached as Enclosure.

2. As per directions issued by SEBI through their advertisement dated 26 Mar 2018, I had submitted the application along with the above Abode Bonds as mentioned at Para 2 above with requisite connected documents to SEBI through the respective Sahara Branch Office,Hinjilicut ,Odisha (Branch Code-2539) for necessary payment.

3. However, no maturity amount have been credited into my bank account till date.

4. If the maturity amount will not be possible to paid at this stage, my original Sahara Abode Bonds as forwarded to SEBI through my application on 14 Jun 2018 may please be returned to my Home Address ie NEW DELHI address repeat NEW DELHI address only at the earliest please for further claiming purposes.”

3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to the application, informed that no information has been sought by the appellant. The respondent also informed that as per available records, no application dated 14.06.2018 of Mrs. Minati Swain, enclosing original Sahara Abode Bonds, either from Mrs. Minati Swain or through Saharas as claimed in her application, was received by SEBI.
4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that she was provided incomplete, misleading or false information.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I find that appellant's query is in the nature of seeking action from the respondent. In this context, I note that the Hon'ble Central Information Commission (**CIC**) in the matter of *Sumanta Banerjee vs. Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited* (Decision dated June 08, 2007), had held that an applicant/information seeker under the RTI Act should ask for information that may be available 'in any material form' as envisaged under section 2(f) of that Act. Further, I note that the Hon'ble CIC in the matter of *Ram Balak Yadav vs. Sheikh Mohammad Anis* (Decision dated May 13, 2009), had held that: "*The appellant is not seeking any information but want certain administrative action by the department. It is apparent that no information was sought as defined under Section 2(f) of the Act*". In view of these observations, I find that the appellant's query cannot be construed as 'information' as defined under section 2(f) of the RTI Act. 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: June 20, 2025

RUCHI CHOJER

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