

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

Appeal No. 6546 of 2025

Sindhu Chandrashekhar Nandedkar	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated July 15, 2025 (received by SEBI on July 16, 2025) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 ("**RTI Act**"). The respondent, by a letter dated August 12, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated August 25, 2025 (received by the Office of Appellate Authority on September 03, 2025). 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 July 15, 2025, sought the following information:

- १) आपके दफ्तरमें आजतक दि. २३.१०.२०१९, १५.११.२०१९, २८.१२.२०१९, २२.०१.२०२०, ०६.०२.२०२०, ११.०३.२०२०, ०८.०७.२०२१ अर्ज किये हैं, दिनांक : - १५.०७.२०२४ इसका भी जबाब दीजिये.
- २) आजतक आपके दफ्तरमें सॉइल प्रॉपर्टीज अँड इन्फ्रा इंडीया लिमिटेड, पुणे इनकी औरसे हुये अफरातफरके बाबत अपने जो भी कारवाही किया है कृपया सटीक और डिटेल्स लिखित जबाब दो.
- ३) आपको हिंदी या इंग्लिश यह दोही भाषा अति है, हम "मराठी" है, हिंदी या इंग्लिश लिखानेकी आवश्यक कागदपत्रे दीजिये.
- ४) दुसरी बात अर्ज मे लगे हुये कोर्ट स्टंप आपके डिपार्टमेंटमे क्यो नही चलते. इसकाभी सटीक प्रमाण दीजिये.

3. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to query nos. 1 and 2 in the application, informed that the information sought does not fall within the preview of SEBI. All complaints related to Soil Properties and Infra India Ltd have been referred to and are being handled by the government of Maharashtra. The respondent had also enclosed along with his reply copy of letters dated April 16, 2021 sent by SEBI to the Chairman, SLCC & Chief Secretary to the Government of Maharashtra & Maharashtra Real Estate Regulatory Authority, respectively, in this regard.

The respondent, in response to query no. 3, informed that the information sought is in the nature of seeking clarification/opinion. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as "information", as defined u/s 2(f) of the RTI Act.

The respondent, in response to query no. 4, informed that appellant about frequently asked questions (FAQs) on RTI, provided by Department of Personnel & Training, Government of India, pertaining to payment of fees for seeking information.

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. With regard to query nos. 1, 2 and 4, I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the queries by providing the information available with him. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
6. Further, I find that the query no. 3 is 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 Central Information Commission (hereinafter referred to as "**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.
7. Further, from the perusal of the appeal and the application, I find that that the same are also in the nature 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 light of the same, I find that no further intervention is warranted at this stage.

8. 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: October 03, 2025

RUCHI CHOJER

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