

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

Appeal No. 6646 of 2025

Harish Chandra : Appellant
Vs
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”), which was transferred to the respondent from Department of Financial Services on November 07, 2025. The respondent, by a letter dated November 18, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/P/25/00028) dated December 01, 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, sought the following information:

"SEBI has officially notified that OANDA57581981 investment account under the name Harish Chandra has been flagged for additional scrutiny according to regulatory requirements from the Securities and Exchange Board of INDIA (SEBI). This is due to suspicions that the account may be involved in activities assisting money laundering through international market investments. To comply with legal regulations and safeguard market integrity, we now require verification of funds for the OANDA57581981. Please understand, OANDA Financial Services, that this process is to ensure the interests of all market participants and to adhere to principles of transparency and compliance. We will guide the investor of OANDA57581981 through the necessary steps and ensure that the process is as smooth and efficient as possible.

We request cooperation from the investor of OANDA57581981 to provide assurance of non-involvement in money laundering transactions, along with the required verification documents and collateral, for prompt completion of the

review and removal of restrictions on the OANDA57581981 account. Please cooperate with SEBI to complete this financial regulatory process."

I heard that this is done after instructions of Hon'ble President of India Smt. Droupadi Murmu Mam but not informed to me.

I & my family, parents facing lot of mental agony & harassment. Because I still not get my money.

Due to actions taken through this letter & Broker banned in India, I unable to withdraw remaining available balance money (Rs. 92,000,00.00) from my Demat account.

I & my family, parents weeping and facing lot of headache, tension, mental agony & harassment.

Under RTI Act. 2005, Please provide following information: -

1. *Where & Who is dealing this matter?*
2. *What actions has been taken till date?*
3. *What's going on?*
4. *What is its status?*
5. *How long it will take?*
6. *How & when I get my complete money?"*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to queries in the application, informed that the queries are 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. Notwithstanding the aforesaid, it may be noted that the entity OANDA Corporation is not registered with SEBI in any capacity and the list of SEBI registered intermediaries is available at SEBI Website

Further, the respondent informed that the copy of letter provided by the appellant appears to be forged. The respondent also informed that in order to report any complaint regarding an unregistered activity, the appellant can submit the complaint on the email id sebi@sebi.gov.in or approach any of the registered offices of SEBI along with relevant details.

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. On consideration, I find that the appellant's queries are in the nature of seeking clarification/opinion 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

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/advises 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. Notwithstanding the aforesaid, I find that the respondent had provided appropriate guidance to the appellant.
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: December 23, 2025

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