

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

Appeal No. 7068 of 2026

Swarnali Basu : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated June 05, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated July 03, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated August 30, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00331).
2. I note that under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, an aggrieved person may prefer the first appeal within thirty days from the receipt of the response from the CPIO of the concerned public authority. In the instant case, the impugned response from the respondent is dated July 03, 2026. The appellant, therefore, should have filed the first appeal on or before expiry of thirty days from the date of receipt of the said response. As noted above, the appellant’s first appeal was received on August 30, 2026. The first appeal has been made after the last date permissible under the RTI Act. The appellant neither made a request for condoning the said delay in filing the appeal nor made any submission explaining the reasons which caused the delay. Considering the absence of a request for condoning the delay and any valid reason that prevented the appellant from filing the appeal in time, I consider this appeal as time barred and hence, liable to be dismissed on that count.
3. Notwithstanding the above observation, I am considering the appeal on merit. I have perused the application and the appeal and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record.
4. **Queries in the application** - The appellant, in his application, sought the following information:

“Hi, My concern is related to UTI scheme RAJLAKSHMI UNIT SCHEME CIRTIFICATE No. R262013069681.

I send an email to them on uticustomer@uti.co.in and mumbai@utiitsl.com but they even do not read my mail properly and wasting time by asking the same scheme name. Please help me to get the details about this scheme, as I want to claim the benefit, my father was purchased it on 1993 and maturity date I crossed 2012.

My father passed away on 2007 so we have lost many docs.

Now I found it and asked them for little help to claim it”

5. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the information sought 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.

Notwithstanding the aforesaid, the respondent informed that the investor may use the MITRA (Mutual Fund Investment Tracing and Retrieval Assistant) Portal to trace inactive and unclaimed Mutual Fund folios. Further, respondent stated that the user of MITRA platform can access the FAQs to use MITRA portal upon login to the portal. The respondent also provided links for accessing SOP and FAQ for Unclaimed Mutual Fund amounts.

6. **Ground of appeal** – On perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response of the respondent.
7. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I concur with the response of the respondent that the queries are in the nature of seeking clarification/opinion 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 or opinion 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.

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 21, 2026

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