

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

Appeal No. 7029 of 2026

Surajit Rout : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated June 09, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated July 07, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated August 07, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00298). 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, in his application, sought the following information:

“Grievance No. DOEAF/E/2026/0000237 was closed on 13.03.2026 with the remark that the trading relates to the year 2014-15 and is beyond the limitation period of one year

Appeal No. SEBII/C/A/26/0000070 dated 19.03.2026 was subsequently filed against the closure of the grievance. In order to understand the basis of the decision and the examination, if any, conducted in the matter, the following information is sought under the RTI Act, 2005:

- 1. Certified copies of all examination reports, scrutiny reports, Action Taken Reports (ATRs), file notings, correspondence and orders relating to Appeal No. SEBII/C/A/26/0000070.*
- 2. Certified copy of the verification report relating to the settlement ledgers and contract notes of my trading account maintained with Geojit Financial Services, as verified with the corresponding records of NSE, BSE or any other relevant stock exchange.*

3. If any discrepancy was identified, kindly provide certified copies of the discrepancy report, directions issued, compensation or remedial measures ordered, and the final action taken/closure report.”

3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to query no. 1 in the application, informed that the information sought pertains to the complaint in CPGRAMS portal. The respondent informed that the appellant can approach the authority of CPGRAMS portal. Notwithstanding the aforesaid, the respondent enclosed a copy of the action history of Appeal No. SEBII/C/A/26/0000070 along with his response.

With regard to query no. 2, the respondent informed that the information sought is not available with SEBI.

With regard to query no. 3, the respondent informed that the information sought is vague and 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.

4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was refused access to the information requested.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. With regard to query no.1, I note that the respondent has enclosed along with his response a copy of the action history of Appeal No. SEBII/C/A/26/0000070. Accordingly, I find that the query no. 1 has been adequately answered.
6. With regard to query no. 2, I note 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 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.
7. With regard to query no. 3, I find that the query 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 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.

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: September 04, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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