

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

Appeal No. 6626 of 2025

Urmila Devi : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application (received by SEBI on September 03, 2025) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent by a letter dated October 31, 2025 responded to the application. The appellant filed an appeal dated November 11, 2025 (received by the Office of Appellate Authority on November 19, 2025). 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, vide her application dated October 27, 2025, sought the following information regarding Sahara Q Shop Scheme and the money collected under this scheme:

1. मेरी **Sahara Q Shop** में जमा राशि को **Global Form** में कब और किस तिथि को बदला गया?
2. वर्तमान में मेरी जमा राशि की स्थिति क्या है (**Account/Unit wise details**)?
3. मेरी राशि का वर्तमान मूल्य (**Current Value**) कितना है?
4. इन राशियों की मैच्योरिटी तिथि (**Maturity Date**) क्या है?
5. मैच्योरिटी अथवा भुगतान कब और किस प्रकार किया जाएगा?
6. यदि अभी तक भुगतान नहीं हुआ है तो निवेशकों को भुगतान की अधिकृत समय-सीमा क्या है?
7. इस विषय में निवेशकों की शिकायत/वाचा करने हेतु किस कार्यालय या प्राधिकारी से संपर्क किया जाए, उसका पूरा पता एवं संपर्क विवरण।
8. **Sahara Q Shop** की मैच्योरिटी राशि (**Maturity Value**) को **Global Four** में बदला गया है या केवल मूल निवेश राशि (**Invested Amount**) को ही **Global Form** में जोड़ा गया है?
9. यदि **Sahara Q Shop** की मैच्योरिटी राशि (**Maturity Value**) को **Global Four** में शामिल नहीं किया गया है, तो उस मैच्योरिटी राशि का क्या होगा और निवेशक को उसका भुगतान कब व किस प्रकार किया जाएगा?

3. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the information sought is not maintained by SEBI.
4. **Ground of appeal** – On perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response of the respondent.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. I note that the respondent has categorically stated that the requested information is not available with SEBI. I note that the respondent can only provide information that is available in the records. In this context, I note that the Hon'ble Central Information Commission in the matter of *Sh. Pattipati Rama Murthy vs. CPIO, SEBI* (Decision dated July 8, 2013), held: “... if it (SEBI) does not have any such information in its possession, the CPIO cannot obviously invent one for the benefit of the Appellant. There is simply no information to be given.” Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
6. I note that the appellant, in her appeal, has requested for transfer of her application to the concerned public authority, if the information sought is not available with SEBI. In this regard, I note from the available records that the respondent, by letters dated September 05, 2025, transferred the application to Economic Offence Wing (**EOW**), UP and Registrar of Companies (**RoC, Mumbai**) in accordance with Section 6(3) of RTI Act. However, EoW, vide their letter October 27, 2025 returned the application to SEBI stating that they did not have the requested information. In light of the aforesaid, I find that no further intervention of this forum is warranted.
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: December 12, 2025

RUCHI CHOJER

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