

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

Appeal No. 6742 of 2026

Ramswaroop Chourasia	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated Nil (received by SEBI on December 26, 2025) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated January 20, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated January 29, 2026 (received by the Office of Appellate Authority on February 09, 2026). 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, vide his application dated Nil, details w.r.t. the funds deposited in the mutual fund folio and demat accounts linked to PAN and Aadhaar numbers of the appellant and his wife (Mrs. Pushpa Chourasia). Additionally, he has sought guidance regarding redemption of the same.
3. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the information sought is not available with SEBI. Notwithstanding the aforesaid, the respondent informed that the appellant can visit the MITRA (Mutual Fund Investment Tracing and Retrieval Assistant) Service platform to trace inactive and unclaimed Mutual Fund folios. The respondent, in this regard, also provided the link for accessing the same. Further, respondent informed that appellant can approach the respective AMCs for redemption of mutual fund investments.

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. I note that the respondent has categorically stated 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 (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.
6. Notwithstanding the above, the respondent has informed that the appellant can visit MITRA service platform to trace inactive and unclaimed mutual fund folios and provided the link for accessing the same. The appellant may be guided by the same.
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: March 05, 2026

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