

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

**Appeal No. 6457 of 2025**

Kinnary Virendrasinh Vaghela : Appellant  
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application dated May 19, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated June 13, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00155) dated June 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. **Queries in the application** - The appellant, in his application dated May 19, 2025, sought the following information:

*“My Demat account vide client ID 17XXXXXXX, DPID IN301774 with Religare Broking Ltd. was frozen by Religare under account freeze instruction report dated 13.09.2019 (copy enclosed). This was under directives to SEBI circular Dt. 03.05.2018. Since last 6 years my Demat account is frozen and my funds are blocked. Lot of communications I have made to BSE Ltd. and Religare but I have not received any official communication about reason. Please provide the detail under which specific reason/issue my above mentioned Demat account is freeze?”*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to query in the application, informed that the information sought by the appellant is not maintained by SEBI in normal course of regulation of securities market. Hence, the same is not available with SEBI. Notwithstanding the aforesaid, the respondent also informed that appellant can refer to the SEBI Circular dated May 03, 2018 and SEBI Master Circular dated November 11, 2024, respectively. The respondent also informed that the appellant can contact his DP for specific reason or lodge a complaint on SCORES website.

4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was refused access to information requested.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I note that the respondent has categorically stated that the requested information is not maintained by SEBI in normal course of regulation of securities market. Hence the same is not available with SEBI. I note that the respondent can only provide information that is available in the records. In this context, I note that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in *Central Board of Secondary Education & Anr. vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay & Ors* (Judgment dated August 9, 2011) held that *"The RTI Act provides access to all information that is available and existing. This is clear from a combined reading of section 3 and the definitions of 'information' and 'right to information' under clauses (f) and (j) of section 2 of the Act. If a public authority has any information in the form of data or analysed data, or abstracts, or statistics, an applicant may access such information, subject to the exemptions in section 8 of the Act. But where the information sought is not a part of the record of a public authority, and where such information is not required to be maintained under any law or the rules or regulations of the public authority, the Act does not cast an obligation upon the public authority, to collect or collate such non-available information and then furnish it to an applicant."* Further, 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. Notwithstanding the above, I find that the respondent has appropriately guided 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: July 22, 2025

**RUCHI CHOJER**

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