

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

Appeal No. 6884 of 2026

Bidish Das

:

Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai

:

Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated April 18, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated May 15, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated May 15, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00181). 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 18, 2026, sought the following information:

“Q 1. Provide the Link (URL) of the Webpage of SEBI NRI Section.

Q 2. Provide the Name, Designation, Address of Office and Contact Details of all

(i) Grievance Redressal Officers,

(ii) Public Relation Officers,

(iii) Coordinators,

(iv) Officers presently on Deputation Basis,

(v) Conciliator,

(vi) Mediator and

(vii) Coordination Officer of SEBI NRI Department / Directorate / Division / Wing / Section.

Q 3. Provide the name and address of all SEBI NRI Specific Offices present in India and outside of India currently operational and not operational.

Q 4. Provide the Soft Copy of all notice, circular, office memorandum, guideline, clarification, Rules and Regulations, Criteria, Subordinate Legislation, Press Release, addendum, corrigendum, etc. issued by SEBI in respect of / in relation to / governing / concerning / addressing / meant for NRI.

Q 5. Provide the Link(s) (URLs) of Webpages of SEBI where details in respect of Q 4 are present.

Q 6. Provide the name of all Companies/ any other body at present which are authorised by SEBI to open NRO Demat Account for NRI.

Q 7. Provide the definition of

(a) Resident Indian and

(b) Non-Resident Indian (NRI) which is followed / considered by SEBI for distinguishing between Resident Indian and Non-Resident Indians.

Q 8. Provide the Soft Copy of all notice, circular, office memorandum, guideline, clarification, Rules and Regulations, Criteria, Subordinate Legislation, Press Release, addendum, corrigendum, etc. issued by SEBI in respect of / in relation to / governing / concerning / addressing / meant for Repatriation and Expatriation of Money for NRI.

Q 9. Provide the Link(s) (URLs) of Webpages of SEBI where details in respect of Q 8 are present.

Q 10. Provide the List of Citizenship Documents which the SEBI used to accept as a Proof of Citizenship of the Republic of India.”

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –With regard to query nos.1, 2, 3, 7 & 10, the respondent informed that information sought is not available with SEBI.

With regard to query nos. 4, 5, 8 and 9, the respondent informed that the all the Acts relating to securities laws, regulations, circulars, guidelines and notifications issued by SEBI from time to time are available in the public domain on the SEBI website.

With regard to query no.6, the respondent informed that the information sought is not maintained by SEBI in normal course of regulation of the securities market.

4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground 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. 1, 2, 3, 7 & 10, the respondent has clearly informed 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. Notwithstanding the aforesaid, the appellant may note that addresses of offices of SEBI, department and divisions of SEBI and the directory of SEBI employees are available on SEBI website. The appellant may be guided the same.
6. With regard to query nos. 4, 5, 8 and 9, I note that the respondent has clearly informed that the requested information can be accessed from SEBI website and hence, the requested information is in the public domain. In this context, I note that the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in *Registrar of Companies & ors. Vs. Dharmendra Kumar Garg & anr.* and the Hon'ble CIC in *Shri K Lall vs. Shri M K Bagri* (CIC/AT/A/2007/00112, order dated April 12, 2007) held 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. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the said response of the respondent.
7. With regard to query no.6, I note that the respondent has informed that the requested information is not maintained by SEBI in the normal course of regulation of securities market. Hence, 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, in the matter of *Lakshminarayanan R vs. SEBI* (order dated February 09, 2023) observed that “*Keeping in view the facts of the case, the Commission observed that the information sought by the appellant regarding Central Depository Services Ltd. was not maintained by the respondent authority in the normal course of regulation of securities market. It is an established law that the information sought for in order to be disclosable under the RTI Act, 2005 must be existent and available in the*

records..... In the instant case, the desired information was not available in the records of the respondent authority...”.

Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of 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: June 12, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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