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

Appeal No. 7160 of 2026

Henil Bagadia	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated October 05, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 ("**RTI Act**"). The respondent, by a letter dated October 23, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated October 26, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00405). 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:

"I had submitted a response on PG portal o under docket DCOYA E 2026 0007051 which was disposed off on 5th October 2026 where the authorities have attached the reply from the company without preliminary investigation. Request to the SEBI authorities for the basis on which the docket has been closed.
What preliminary investigation has been conducted by the authorities on the case and has the authority examined the violation of SEBI LODR Regulations 2015 Regulation 4 sub regulation 2 a on failure to facilitate effective participation and asking questions and Regulation 4 sub regulation 2 c on denial of equitable treatment.
What preliminary investigation has been conducted by the authorities on the case and has the authority examined the violation of Companies Act 2013 under which a registered member attending in my own capacity has statutory right to speak is inherent.
What preliminary investigation has been conducted by the authorities on the case and has the authority examined the violation of Secretarial Standards SS 2 states violation of the mandate that members must be given a fair opportunity to ask questions,

What was the basis on which the complaint has been closed without comments from SEBI on the allegations for violation and corporate governance raised against the company."

3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to the application, stated that the information sought is in the nature of seeking clarification. 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. On consideration, I find that the queries are in the nature of seeking clarification from the respondent. I find that the said queries cannot be construed as seeking 'information' as defined under section 2(f) of the RTI Act. Consequently, the respondent did not have an obligation to provide such clarification under the RTI Act. In this context, reliance is placed on matter of *Azad Singh vs. CPIO, Oriental Insurance Company Limited* (order dated March 23, 2021) wherein Hon'ble Central Information Commission(**CIC**) observed that "*7. The Commission, after hearing the submissions of both the parties and after perusal of records, observed that some queries of the appellant are in the nature of seeking explanation/opinion/advice/confirmation/clarification from the CPIO and he has expected that the CPIO firstly should analyze the documents and then provide information to the appellant. But the CPIO is not supposed to create information; or to interpret information; or to compile information as per the desire of the appellant under the ambit of the RTI Act. As per Section 2(f) of the RTI Act, the reasons/opinions/advices can only be provided to the applicants if it is available on record of the public authority. The CPIO cannot create information in the manner as sought by the appellant. The CPIO is only a communicator of information based on the records held in the office and hence, he cannot be expected to do research work to deduce anything from the material therein and then supply it to him."* 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.

RUCHI CHOJER
Digitally signed by RUCHI CHOJER
Date: 2026.11.16 15:19:51 +05'30'

Place: Mumbai
Date: November 16, 2026

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