

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

Appeal No. 4351 of 2021

Renu : Appellant
Vs
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated June 08, 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 16, 2021, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated June 22, 2021, against the said response dated June 16, 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 her application dated June 08, 2021, sought the following information:
 1. *How much amount can a central employee invest annually in mutual funds?*
 2. *Can central employee do long term and short term investment in stock market?*
 3. *If yes, how much amount be invested annually?*
 4. *Will the above investment have to be reported to anyone or permission has to be taken from anyone? If yes, with whom?*
3. The respondent, in response to query numbers 1, 2, 3 and 4, informed that the information sought does not pertain to SEBI.
4. **Ground of appeal-** The appellant has filed an appeal on the ground that the information provided was incomplete, misleading or false. The appellant, in her appeal, inter alia, requested to provide accurate information so that employees get benefitted.
5. On perusal of the queries, it appears that the queries are in the nature of seeking clarification/opinion from the respondent regarding investment that can be made by central employee. It is understood that the respondent is not supposed to create information; or to interpret information; or to furnish

clarification to the appellant under the ambit of the RTI Act. I find that the said queries cannot be construed as seeking 'information' as defined under section 2 (f) of the RTI Act. In this context, reference is made to the matter of *Vineet Pandey vs. CPIO, United India Insurance Company Limited* (Judgment dated January 21, 2021), wherein similar observations were made by the Hon'ble CIC. Further, in the matter of *Shri Shantaram Walavalkar vs. CPIO, SEBI* (Decision dated January 17, 2013), I note that the Hon'ble CIC held: "... we would also like to observe that, under the Right to Information (RTI) Act, the citizen has the responsibility to specify the exact information he wants; he is not supposed to seek any opinion or comments or clarifications or interpretations from the CPIO...". In view of the said observations, the respondent did not have an obligation to provide such clarification/opinion under the RTI Act.

6. Notwithstanding the same, I note that the respondent has categorically stated that the information sought does not pertain to SEBI. I do not find any reason to disbelieve the observation of the respondent. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response.
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: July 20, 2021

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