

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

**Appeal No. 6774 of 2026**

Parivesh Shukla : Appellant  
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application dated February 12, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated February 24, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00085) dated February 24, 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. **Queries in the application** - The appellant, in his application dated February 12, 2026, sought the following information:

*“ Kindly provide the following information in respect of Cosmic CRF Ltd CIN L27100WB2021PLC250447 a public limited company*

*1 Provide certified copy of RDSO Licence Certificate submitted by Cosmic CRF Ltd to SEBI at any time including during DRHP filing listing process compliance filing or any other disclosure*

*2 Provide date on which such RDSO Licence copy was submitted to SEBI along with covering letter annexures and all supporting documents*

*3 Provide certified copy of entire correspondence between SEBI and Cosmic CRF Ltd regarding RDSO Licence claim if any*

*4 Provide copy of enquiry report inspection report noting or internal communication made by SEBI regarding verification of RDSO Licence of the company*

5 Provide copy of disclosure made by the company before SEBI where it claimed possession of RDSO Licence

6 Provide information whether SEBI verified the authenticity of such RDSO Licence from Research Designs and Standards Organisation and if yes provide record of such verification

7 Provide current status of any investigation complaint or examination pending before SEBI in relation to this matter.”

3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to query nos. 1, 2 and 3, informed that the company, Cosmic CRF Ltd., filed its DRHP under Chapter IX of SEBI (Issue of Capital and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2018[SEBI ICDR Regulations] before BSE for its proposed listing on BSE SME Platform. Hence, no information related to RDSO license certificate is available with SEBI. The respondent, in response to query nos. 4, 5, 6 and 7, also informed that the requested information is not available with SEBI. The respondent, in this regard, informed that SEBI does not provide its observation on DRHP filings made with exchanges under Chapter IX of SEBI (ICDR) Regulations.
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. The respondent, in his reply, has stated that the company, Cosmic CRF Ltd., had filed its DRHP before BSE for its proposed listing on SME Platform. The respondent also informed that SEBI does not provide its observation on DRHP filings made with exchanges under Chapter IX of SEBI (ICDR) Regulations. Hence, the respondent has informed 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 *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. 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 24, 2026**

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