

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

Appeal No. 7088 of 2026

Suriyanarayanan Ramachandran : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated September 06, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated September 16, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated September 16, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00347). 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:

“Would like to know how many complaints have been filed against ICICI DIRECT. Under each categories like non execution of order. Technical glitch ect ect for below timelines.
 1. *For past 10 years.*
 2. *For past 5 years*
 3. *From 2024 December. Also against other brokers cumulatively for same time period.”*
3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to application, informed that the information sought is not maintained by SEBI in the manner/format as specified. Hence, information sought is not available with SEBI.
4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was refused access to information requested.

5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I note that the respondent has informed that the information sought is not maintained by SEBI in the manner/format as specified. I note that the CPIO is expected to provide information that is available and existing in the records. 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.....” I also note that similar response/submission provided by the respondent was accepted by the Hon'ble Central Information Commission (CIC) in the matter of the *Prateek Tewari v. CPIO, SEBI* (Order dated January 19, 2023) and it was observed that “In respect to point no. 13 the information sought cannot be directed to be disclosed as the same was sought in a particular format and the CPIO submitted that the same is not available in that format.” In view of these observations, I do not find any deficiency in the response.
6. Further, I note that the appellant in his appeal has sought further information pertaining to his application. As held by the Hon'ble CIC in *Harish Prasad Divedi vs. Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited* (decided on January 28, 2014), an information seeker cannot be allowed to expand the scope of his RTI enquiry at appeal stage. Accordingly, I find that the said submissions do not warrant consideration at this stage.
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: October 12, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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