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

Appeal No. 6920 of 2026

Varsha J Soni	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated May 23, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 ("**RTI Act**"). The respondent, by a letter dated June 01, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated June 08, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00211). 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 her application dated May 23, 2026 sought the following information:

"The Public Information Officer (PIO)

Subject: Application under RTI Act regarding Demat Account Information

Sir/Madam,

Please provide the following information related to my demat account and investor records: my Account Opening yr date with years - all yr transaction dates - all yr transaction statement

1. Details of complaints registered against my demat account.

2. Information regarding any pledge/ marigin pledge/ collateral /encumbered shares / hypothecation marked in my demat account details date to date.

3. Details of any regulatory action or investor grievance related to my account.

4. Any available records of unauthorized transfer of securities.

Applicant Details: Name: varsha j soni PAN Number: AEXPSxxxx Demat Client ID: IN300xx Depository Participant (Broker) Name: SHAREKHAN LIMITED Period Required: 2018 APRIL TO TILL DATE I am enclosing the prescribed RTI fee. Regards, VARSHA J SONI."

3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the information sought is not maintained by SEBI in normal course of regulation of securities market. Hence, the same is not available with SEBI. Notwithstanding aforesaid, the respondent informed that the appellant can approach his depository participant.

4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that she 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 informed that the requested information is not maintained by SEBI in normal course of regulation of securities market. Hence, I note that the requested information 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 *Lakshminarayanan R vs. SEBI* (order dated February 09, 2023) observed that "*Keeping in view the facts of the case, the Commission observed that the information sought by the appellant regarding Central Depository Services Ltd. was not maintained by the respondent authority in the normal course of regulation of securities market. It is an established law that the information sought for in order to be disclosable under the RTI Act, 2005 must be existent and available in the records……… In the instant case, the desired information was not available in the records of the respondent authority…"*. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of 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: July 02, 2026

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