

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

**Appeal No. 6584 of 2025**

Kumar Gautam : Appellant  
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”), which was transferred from Ministry of Corporate Affairs to SEBI on August 26, 2025. The respondent, by a letter dated September 23, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00267) dated October 05, 2025. 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, sought the following information:

*“I have bought 680006 equity shares (Demat Account number – 1203320019xxxxxxx) of Uttam Value Steels limited in Nov. 2020 and it was delisted in Dec.2020 through Corporate action by company giving the refence of approved resolution plan of 6 may 2020 by NCLT. Now company has been renamed as Evonith Value steels limited. 1. Uttam value steels limited has informed to BSE and NSE that Entire pre CIRP paid up capital of the company including equity shares and preference shares (on a fully diluted basis) shall stand cancelled without any pay-out and that the face value of these shares shall be transferred to the capital reserve of the company . 2. Evonith Value steels limited has Kept 42,10,52,637 equity shares in CDSL/NSDL in dematerialized form including promoters shares since beginning which this company is carrying through Resolution plan.*

*Please provide information under RTI Act 2005 on the following points*

*i. The shares kept in CDSL/NSDL in dematerialised form by Evonith steels limited belong to the shares of mine also which have been declared by Evonith Value Steels limited through form no. PAS- 6.*

*ii. Company Evonith Value Steels limited will allot shares to me also as per resolution plan when it relist by rematerialization of dematerialised shares.*

*iii. Name of first appellate authority.”*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to query nos. i and ii in the application, informed 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.

The respondent, in response to query no. iii, informed the names of First Appellate Authority designated in SEBI.

4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant, in his appeal, has submitted that he was provided incomplete, misleading or false information.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. With regard to query nos. i and ii in the application, I concur with the response of the respondent 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 Central Information Commission 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.
6. With regard to query no. iii, I note that the respondent has adequately addressed the query by providing the information available to him. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response.

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: October 30, 2025**

**RUCHI CHOJER**

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