

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

Appeal No. 6680 of 2026

Appellant
Sanjay Kumar

Vs

Respondent
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated January 02, 2026 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated January 05, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00003) dated January 06, 2026. 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 his application dated January 02, 2026, sought the following information:

“ 1. Kindly provide a certified copy of any registration done by SEBI against Bahubala Pvt. Ltd having its CIN U70100JH2022PTC018477 under the SEBI Act, 1992, and related regulations, including whether the company is authorised to collect funds from investors.”
3. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the query is vague and not specific and is in the nature of seeking clarification. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as “Information”, as defined u/s 2(f) of the RTI Act. However, respondent informed that the details of SEBI Registered Intermediaries are available on SEBI website and provided the path for accessing the same.
4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was refused access to the information requested.

5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I find that the appellant's query is in the nature of seeking clarification from the respondent. I find that the said query 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/ 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. Notwithstanding the aforesaid, I find that the respondent has informed that the list of SEBI registered intermediaries is available on SEBI website. The appellant can refer to SEBI website for the requested information. Hence, I find that the respondent has provided appropriate guidance to the appellant in obtaining the requested information.
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: January 30, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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