

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

Appeal Nos. 6734, 6735, 6736, 6737 & 6738 of 2026

Sundaresan : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed five identical applications under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”), two of the applications were transferred by Ministry of Corporate Affairs to the respondent on January 15, 2026 and three applications were transferred to the respondent from Department of Economic Affairs. The respondent, by a common letter dated February 03, 2026 responded to the applications filed by the appellant. The appellant filed five identical appeals (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00054, Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00055, Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00056, Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00057, Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00058) dated February 8, 2026. I have carefully considered the applications, the response and the appeals and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record.
2. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was refused access to information requested.
3. **Query no. 1 in the application** – The query no. 1 in the application is reproduced hereunder:

“....NHB Board has a nominee of RBI and 3 of Central Govt . IBBI Governing Body has 1 nominee each of RBI , Ministry of Law , Ministry Corporate Affairs , Ministry Finance and SEBI Board has 1 nominee of Ministry Finance , one of Ministry Corporate Affairs and 1 of RBI . RBI of course has directors nominated by Ministry Finance etc etc”
4. **Reply of the Respondent** – With respect to query no. 1, the respondent has stated that no information was sought by the appellant vide the said query.

5. I have perused the query and the response thereto. On consideration, I concur with the response of the respondent that no information was sought by the appellant. Accordingly, I find that no further interference of this forum is warranted.
6. **Query nos. 2, 4-10, 12-31, 33-47, 51-56 and 59-** The appellant, vide query nos. 2, 4-10, 12-31, 33-47, 51-56 and 59 had *inter alia*, sought information pertaining to various authorities viz. Department of Financial Services and Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance, RBI, NHB, Ministry of Corporate Affairs, ICAI, ICSI, RERA and IBBI. The appellant that also sought information pertaining to the statutes viz. SICA 1985, IBC, NHB Act.
7. **Reply of the Respondent** – With regard to query nos. 2, 4-10, 12-31, 33-47, 51-56 and 59, the respondent has informed that the information sought does not pertain to SEBI.
8. I have perused the above mentioned queries and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I note that the respondent has categorically mentioned that the requested information does not pertain to SEBI. Hence, I note that the requested information is not available with SEBI. In this context, I note that the Hon'ble Central Information Commission (hereinafter referred to as "**CIC**") 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.
9. **Query nos. 3, 32, 49 and 58 in the application** – The appellant, vide query nos. 3, 32, 49 and 58 in the application, sought the following information:

" 3) SEBI and others have a duty of ensuring recovery of more than 100% admitted claims in insolvencies. All had to duty in implementing SICA 1985 and failed there and have also duties under IBC.

32) Financial service providers eg DHFL, Reliance capital etc; and real estate etc; The following are based on RBI and its nominees 'roles under RBI Act, SEBI Act, IBC, NHB Act etc etc and insolvency of financial service providers and internal control in banks, role of banks in RERA;

49) All ATRs must contain list of dates, action on the relevant dates, responses received if any,, ATR post receipt of responses, reminders if no response etc etc. and results of ATR considering insolvencies, losses in insolvencies, real estate stallings etc etc

58) ATR on untrue statements in Board Reports, auditors flouting SA 720, auditors reporting qualified reports as unqualified, secretarial auditors not reporting on violation of RERA and Companies Act, including dates on which matters

were raised with Ministry Corporate Affairs, responses of the Ministry and subsequent action by SEBI --- reportable under SEBI annual report laws, but not reported.”

10. **Reply of the Respondent** -The respondent, in response to query nos. 3, 32, 49 and 58 in the application, informed that the information sought is vague and not specific. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as "information", as defined u/s 2(f) of the RTI Act.
11. I have perused the queries and the response provided thereto. With regard to query nos. 3, 32, 49 & 58, I find that the queries are vague and not specific. It is an established law that the information sought for in order to be disclosable under the RTI Act, must be clear, specific and available in the records of the public authority. In this context, I note that in the matter of *Mr. T. V. Sundaresan vs. CPIO, Securities and Exchange Board of India* (Decision dated November 24, 2021), the Hon’ble CIC held: *“The framework of the RTI Act, 2005 expects that the information sought is specific and believed to be existing with the public authority in documented or material form as such; which can be shared with the appellant as per the provisions of the RTI Act. Answering to broad, multiple and general queries and presumptive documents that should have been generated as per the expectation of the appellant cannot be furnished under the provisions of the Act.”* Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
12. **Query nos. 48, 50 and 57-** The appellant, vide query nos. 48, 50 and 57, sought the following information:

“48) The annual reports of IBBI and SEBI must meet the requirements of SEBI annual report rules and IBBI annual report rules and of course both must be placed for approval of the respective Boards - Now from the pages at <https://ibbi.gov.in/about/board-meetings> and <https://www.sebi.gov.in/sebiweb/about/AboutAction.do?doBoard> Meeting ⇒yes it does not appear that the annual reports are placed at the relevant Board meetings for approval. ATR on the matter. Also for NHB

50) The annual reports of IBBI and SEBI do not meet the requirements of law – ATR

57)ATR- considering eg Satyam Computers, Spot Exchange, DHFL, ILFS, Yes Bank, Reliance Capital etc and duties of SEBI in ensuring that realisations in insolvencies are more than 100%. Timely action by SEBI and Ministry Corporate Affairs are needed. In Ansal the status is miserable for some years no action was taken even after my mail in 2022 and when I prewarned with evidence that at 2023-24 AGM fraud will be perpetrated no action was taken and it appears SEBI does not know what AGM fraud is and neither do others as no such action was taken by SEBI ATR as on date pls”

13. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to query nos. 48, 50 and 57, informed that the information sought is in the nature of grievance. The respondent has informed that taking action or resolution of grievance does not come under the provisions of RTI Act. Therefore, it does not qualify as information under provisions of section 2(f) of RTI Act.
14. I have perused the above mentioned queries and the response thereto. On consideration, I concur with the respondent that queries are in the nature of seeking action/redressal of grievance. I note that redressal of grievance does not come under the purview of the RTI Act. In this context, I note that the Hon'ble CIC, in the matter of *Mr. Surendra Vishwakarma vs. President Secretariat* (Order dated April 29, 2016) observed that *"In this context, we note that the RTI Act cannot be used to make the respondent to do certain things or take certain action for the reason that the Act is not the proper law for redressal of grievances/disputes and there are other appropriate forum(s) for resolving such matters."* In view of the same, I find that the query nos. 48, 50 & 57 have been adequately addressed and no further intervention is warranted at this stage.
15. **Query no. 11 in the application-** The appellant, vide query no. 11, sought the following information:
"11)Pls inform the number of Board Meetings / governing Board meetings of IBBI, NHB, SEBI must be held in a year"
16. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to query no. 11, informed that the meetings of the Board of SEBI are governed by the Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992 and the Securities and Exchange Board of India (Procedure for Board Meetings) Regulations, 2001. The respondent has also informed that a copy of the Act and the Regulations are available in the public domain.
17. I have perused the query and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I find that the requested information is available in public domain. In this context, I note that the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in *Registrar of Companies & ors. Vs. Dharmendra Kumar Garg & anr.* and the Hon'ble CIC in *Shri K Lall vs. Shri M K Bagri* (CIC/AT/A/2007/00112, order dated April 12, 2007) held that if the relevant information is available in the public domain, the same cannot be said to be information held by the public authority and consequently, there is no obligation to provide such information to an applicant under the RTI Act. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the said response of the respondent.

18. 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: March 05, 2026

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