

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

Appeal No. 4349 of 2021

Aman Kumar : Appellant
Vs
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated June 24, 2021 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated June 15, 2021, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated June 18, 2021, against the said response dated June 15, 2021. I have carefully considered the application, the response 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, vide his application dated June 24, 2021, sought the following information:

“Provide the list of traded quantity and price at time between 14:49 to 14:50 dated 25.03.2021 (total 1 minute) of symbol BANKNIFTY21MAR33500CE NIFTY BANK OPTION 33500 CE EXPIRY 25.03.2021 NATIONAL EXCAHNGE.”
3. The respondent, in response to the query 1, informed that the query is not clear and specific. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as “information”, as defined under section 2(f) of the RTI Act.
4. **Ground of appeal-** The appellant has filed an appeal on the ground that the information provided was incomplete, misleading or false. The appellant has reiterated his query in the appeal. The appellant has also submitted that his query is clear.
5. Upon a perusal of the query, I note that the same is vague. Further, it is difficult to ascertain what exact information has been sought by the appellant. I am inclined to agree with the observation of the respondent that the request for information made therein was vague and not specific and the same

cannot be construed as seeking “information” as defined under section 2(f) of the RTI Act. In this context, I note that in the matter of *Sbri S. C. Sharma vs. CPIO, Securities and Exchange Board of India* (Decision dated August 30, 2012), the Hon’ble CIC held: “*Since the Appellant had not clearly stated what exact information he wanted, the CPIO could not have provided any specific information to him. We would like to advise the Appellant that he might like to specify the exact information he wants from the SEBI and prefer a fresh application before the CPIO.*” In view of these observations, I find that the respondent is not obliged to provide a response where the information sought is vague and not specific. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response.

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.

Place: Mumbai

Date: July 16, 2021

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