

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

**Appeal No. 4370 of 2021**

Prerit Misra : Appellant  
Vs  
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application dated June 19, 2021 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated July 19, 2021, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated July 20, 2021, against the said response dated July 19, 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 19, 2021, *inter alia*, sought all the ATRs to complaints filed by the appellant on SCORES regarding Varun Shipping Ltd (Inc.Varun Global/Resources) from December 2015 to date. The appellant also specifically sought the ATR with respect to complaint number SEBIE/MH20/00....68/1.
3. The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the query is vague and not specific and accordingly, the same cannot be construed as “information”, as defined under section 2(f) of the RTI Act. The respondent also observed that SEBI has responded multiple times (240 times on SCORES since November 03, 2015) to his grievances pertaining to Varun Global Ltd./Varun Resources Ltd. registered through SCORES platform and RTI applications.
4. The respondent also informed that Varun Resources Ltd. has been liquidated under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016. Further, Varun Global Limited published a Public Announcement notice in newspapers Financial Express and Jansatta on June 11, 2018, pursuant to the grant of relaxation by SEBI vide letter dated October 31, 2017, from the applicability of the Rule 19(2)(b) of the Securities Contracts (Regulation) Rules, 1957. It was also mentioned that Varun Global Ltd. is yet to approach the Exchange for listing. Further, information was provided regarding approval of adjudication proceedings in the

matter of Varun Global Ltd. the appellant was informed that any further regulatory action, if taken by SEBI in the said matter, will be published on the SEBI website. Additionally, the respondent also stated that the above status has been informed to the appellant in reply to all the complaints filed by the appellant since 2020. A copy of the ATR pertaining to complaint number SEBIE/MH20/00....68/1 was also provided to the appellant.

5. **Ground of appeal-** The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that access to the requested information was refused. The appellant, in his appeal, alleged that his SCORES account has been blocked and that the ATRs cannot be accessed.
6. I note that the appellant has sought all ATRs regarding complaints filed by him against Varun Shipping Ltd (Inc.Varun Global/Resources) from December 2015 to date. The appellant also specifically sought the ATR to complaint number SEBIE/MH20/00....68/1. On consideration, I find that neither the application nor the submissions made in the appeal clearly specify the exact details of the complaints in respect of which the ATRs were sought (except the one specifically provided by the appellant). I find that the request is vague for want of precision on the exact nature of details requested, complaint registration number, the relevant period during which the complaints were lodged in SCORES etc. In this regard, the Hon'ble CIC in *Ms. Sarika Jain vs National Hydroelectric Power Corporation Limited* held that *“As regards the first part i.e. copies of all documents in relation to the contracts mentioned in the RTI application, the Commission finds that the term "all" used by the Appellant here is very vague and does not pin point the particular document she wants to obtain from the Respondents. The Appellant is, therefore, advised to be more specific and identify the documents she wants to obtain from the Respondents .....*” The request of the appellant is similarly vague in nature and hence the aforesaid observations shall become applicable to it. I find that the respondent is not obliged to provide information where the query is vague and not specific.
7. Without prejudice to the above observation, I note that the respondent has provided the Action History and the Action Taken report with respect to SCORES complaint number SEBIE/MH20/00....68/1. Further, the respondent also informed regarding the current status of action taken by SEBI in the matter of Varun Global Ltd. and Varun Resources Ltd. The respondent also categorically stated that the above status has been informed to the appellant in reply to all the complaints filed by the him since 2020. Accordingly, I am of the opinion that the respondent has adequately addressed the query by providing the information available with him. Therefore, the response does not call for interference of this forum.

8. On perusal of available records, I note that the appellant has filed multiple applications seeking information related to his complaints filed on SCORES and also seeking the ATRs pertaining to his complaints. It is also observed that the copies of Action History/ ATRs pertaining to specific complaints regarding Varun Global Ltd./Varun Resources Ltd., have been provided previously by the respondent and the same has been acknowledged by the appellant in his applications. In this context, it is pertinent to mention herein that the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of *Public Information Officer, Registrar (Administration) vs. B. Bharathi*, (Order dated 17.09.2014 in W.P. No. 26781/2013), has held that *"... The action of the second respondent in sending numerous complaints and representations and then following the same with the RTI applications; that it cannot be the way to redress his grievance; that he cannot overload a public authority and divert its resources disproportionately while seeking information and that the dispensation of information should not occupy the majority of time and resource of any public authority, as it would be against the larger public interest..."* The Hon'ble CIC, in the matter of *Samir Sardana vs. CPIO, Mormugao Port Trust* (order dated March 01, 2021) also referred to the said observations made by the Hon'ble High Court, while dismissing the appeal. I also note that in the context of misuse of provisions of RTI Act, the Hon'ble CIC, in *R. P. Verma vs. CPIO, Ordinance Factories* (Decision dated September 5, 2018) strongly criticised the practice of filing multiple applications on similar matters.
9. 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: August 10, 2021

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