

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

Appeal No. 6973 of 2026

Bharat Bhushan Sharma : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application (received by SEBI on April 16, 2026) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated June 15, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/P/26/00043; received by Office of Appellate Authority on July 14, 2026). I have perused the application, the response of the respondent 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, has stated that he had invested an amount of Rs. 4,76,000/- in Saradha Group and that the same has not been refunded to him yet. The appellant has also sought information as to when the said amount would be refunded to him.
3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to the application, informed that Hon’ble Calcutta High Court had assigned the task of disposal of assets and refund to investors in the matter of Saradha Group of Companies to the Hon’ble Justice (Retired) S.P. Talukdar Committee (“One Man Committee”). Accordingly, the information sought by the appellant is not available with SEBI.
4. **Ground of appeal** – On perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response of the respondent.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. The respondent, in his response, has categorically mentioned that the requested information is not available with SEBI. In this context, 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.

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: August 07, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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