

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

**Appeal No. 6891 of 2026**

Avishek Kumar : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application dated April 20, 2026 received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated May 19, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated May 20, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00188). 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 dated April 20, 2026 sought the following information:

*“Listed Company-IPO/Prelisting/ Offer document (shares)”*

*For the following periods:*

*1. FY 2023-24*

*2. FY 2024-25*

*3. FY 2025-26*

*4. From 01-04-2026 till the date on which the information is compiled or furnished*

*The information requested is as follows:*

1. *Period-wise total number of complaints registered in SCORES under the above category.*
2. *Period-wise number of such complaints in which Association of Investment Bankers of India (AIBI) appears anywhere in the complaint workflow, including under any available field or label such as designated body, assigned to, action taken by, copy-marked, participant, or any equivalent workflow designation as maintained in records.*
3. *Period-wise number of such complaints in which a remark entered by AIBI exactly matches the following text:*  
  
*“Dear Investor, Your complaint pertains to violations of provisions of Securities law which is beyond the purview of SCORES and if there is any violation of securities laws may be taken up on MI Portal. Please check the Investor FAQs on SCORES home page and lodge your complaint accordingly.”*
4. *Period-wise number of such complaints in which a remark entered by AIBI exactly matches the following longer text:*  
*“Dear Investor, Your complaint pertains to violations of provisions of Securities law which is beyond the purview of SCORES and if there is any violation of securities laws may be taken up on MI Portal. Please check the Investor FAQs on SCORES home page and lodge your complaint accordingly. Thank you for your time and consideration. Team AIBI.”*
5. *If period-wise counts for Items 3 and 4 are not maintained as pre-compiled figures, then kindly provide the existing searchable electronic output, report, query result, or complaint-wise extract from SCORES or related records identifying complaints in the Date: 20-04-2026 above category where remarks entered by AIBI contain one or more of the following words or phrases:*
  - a. *“violations of provisions of Securities law”*
  - b. *“beyond the purview of SCORES”*
  - c. *“MI Portal”*
  - d. *“Investor FAQs”*
  - e. *“SCORES home page”*
6. *If counts for Items 2 to 5 are not maintained in compiled form, kindly provide a complaintwise extract, limited to the following fields as available on record:*
  - a. *complaint registration number*
  - b. *complaint category*

*c. date of receipt / registration*

*d. action taken by*

*e. assigned to / designated body / participant field*

*f. action type*

*g. action date*

*h. verbatim remark entered by AIBI*

*i. closure / disposal / redirection / return status*

*j. date of such status change*

*7. Period-wise number of complaints in the above category where, after an AIBI remark of the kind referred to in Items 3 to 5, the complaint was shown in records as closed, disposed, redirected, or returned.*

*8. Period-wise number of complaints in the above category where the available workflow history shows the following sequence:*

*a. AIBI entered a remark of the kind referred to in Items 3 to 5;*

*b. thereafter the concerned entity submitted ATR / reply; and*

*c. thereafter AIBI entered a further remark.*

*9. If the count sought in Item 8 is not maintained as a compiled figure, kindly provide the existing workflow-history extract or report for such complaints, limited to complaint number, event date, actor / role field, event type, remark text, and status field, with personal details redacted if necessary.*

*10. Month-wise breakup, if available on record, for each above period, of complaints in the stated category where AIBI entered remarks containing references to the matter being beyond SCORES and/ or directing the complainant to MI Portal.*

*11. Copies of the current and historical records, during the above periods, governing or relating to the use of such remarks on SCORES by AIBI or any designated body / workflow participant, including:*

*a. SOPs*

*b. user manuals*

*c. workflow rules*

*d. internal guidance notes*

*e. circulars / instructions*

*f. templates*

*g. standard text banks / canned responses*

*h. macros / configuration records*

*i. administrative approvals*

12. Copies of records showing the basis on which AIBI acts or acted in the above complaint category as designated body, copy-marked body, assigned participant, workflow participant, or under any equivalent role or designation, including orders, approvals, authorisations, agreements, role-mapping records, note sheets, correspondence, or system configuration records, as available.

13. Copies of records showing the available electronic data fields, logs, reports, search outputs, or system-generated reports by which SCORES can identify:

*a. remark text*

*b. actor identity / user / body entering the remark*

*c. workflow stage*

*d. status change*

*e. closure / disposal / redirection / return f. designated-body involvement*

14. Copy of the record-retention schedule / policy / guideline applicable to SCORES complaint history, remark logs, templates / text banks, and designated-body or workflow-history records relevant to the above category

3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to query no.1 in the application, informed that the information pertaining to the number of complaints registered in SCORES during financial years 2023-2024, 2024-2025 and 2025-2026 is available in the annual report of SEBI. The respondent stated that appellant can refer to annual report published every year; under the section of redressal of investor grievance

of Chapter-“Protection of the Investor Interests”, with respect to SCORES data on complaints received. The respondent also provided the link for accessing the same. The respondent also informed that the information pertaining to the period April 01, 2026 till date is not available in the format sought by the appellant.

With regard to query nos. 2 to 14, the respondent informed that the information sought is not available with SEBI in the format sought by the appellant.

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 requested information sought for the financial years 2023-2024, 2024-2025 and 2025-2026, is available in the annual report, which can be accessed from SEBI website. Hence, I find that requested information is available on public domain. In this context, I note that the Hon’ble Delhi High Court, in the matter of *Registrar of Companies & Ors. Vs. Dharmendra Kumar Garg & Anr.* and the Hon’ble Central Information Commission (CIC), in the matter of *Shri K Lall vs. Shri M K Bagri* (CIC/AT/A/2007/00112, order dated April 12, 2007), *inter alia*, observed that if the relevant information is available in the public domain, the same cannot be said to be information held by the public authority and consequently there is no obligation to provide such information to an applicant under the RTI Act. In view of these observations, I find that the respondent cannot be obliged to research and compile the information which is already available in the public domain and then provide the same to the appellant. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
6. With regard to query nos. 2 to 14 and information sought in query no.1 with respect to the year 2026, I note that the requested information is not available in the format sought by the appellant. In this context, I note that Hon’ble High Court of Delhi in its judgment dated 04.12.2014 in case of *The Registrar, Supreme Court of India vs. Commodore Lokesh K. Batra and Ors.* [W.P.(C) No. 6634/2011] held that: “11. Insofar as the question of disclosing information that is not available with the public authority is concerned, the law is now well settled that the Act does not enjoin a public authority to create, collect or collate information that is not available with it. There is no obligation on a public authority to process any information in order to create further information as is sought by an applicant.....”. In view of the aforesaid, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.

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: June 18, 2026**

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