

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

Appeal No. 6628 of 2025

T Sandeep : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated October 30, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated November 20, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00302) dated November 21, 2025. 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. **Query in the application** - The appellant, in his application dated October 30, 2025, sought the following information.

“Under Section 6(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, I wish to obtain the following information regarding age relaxation for serving Central Government employees applying to SEBI:

- 1. Please provide rules orders or internal guidelines governing age relaxation for such applicants.*
- 2. How many years of continuous service are required for availing such age relaxation if any.*
- 3. Whether SEBI follows DoPT guidelines or has its own policy.*
- 4. Whether probation clearance is mandatory or completion of probation period alone is sufficient when formal clearance is delayed due to administrative reasons.*
- 5. Provide copies of any HR circulars or notifications issued in last 10 years regarding this issue.*
- 6. If SEBI has sought clarification from DoPT on this issue please provide copies of such correspondence and reply.”*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to query nos. 1 and 2 in the application, informed that the information sought is vague and not specific. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as “Information”, as defined u/s 2(f) of the RI Act. However, with regard to the ongoing SEBI Recruitment 2025 of Grade A officers, the respondent informed that appellant can refer to applicable age relaxations under Age limit section on page 4 of the advertisement.

The respondent, in response to query nos. 3 and 4, informed that the queries are in the nature of seeking clarification/opinion. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as “Information”, as defined u/s 2(f) of the RTI Act.

The respondent, in response to query nos. 5 and 6, informed that the information sought is vague and not specific. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as “Information”, as defined u/s 2(f) of the RTI Act.

4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was refused access to the information requested.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. With regard to query nos. 1, 2, 5 and 6, I concur with the response of the respondent that the queries are vague and not specific. It is an established law that the information sought for in order to be disclosable under the RTI Act, must be clear, specific and available in the records of the public authority. In this context, I note that in the matter of *Mr. T. V. Sundaresan vs. CPIO, Securities and Exchange Board of India* (Decision dated November 24, 2021), the Hon’ble Central Information Commission (hereinafter referred to as “**CIC**”) held: “*The framework of the RTI Act, 2005 expects that the information sought is specific and believed to be existing with the public authority in documented or material form as such; which can be shared with the appellant as per the provisions of the RTI Act. Answering to broad, multiple and general queries and presumptive documents that should have been generated as per the expectation of the appellant cannot be furnished under the provisions of the Act.*” Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent. Notwithstanding the aforesaid, I note that respondent has informed the appellant that he can refer to the recruitment advertisement for Officer Grade A, 2025 for information pertaining to the age relaxation. Thus, I find that the respondent has provided appropriate guidance to the appellant in obtaining the requested information.
6. With regard to query nos. 3 and 4, I concur with the response of the respondent that the queries are in the nature of seeking clarification/opinion from the respondent. I find that the said queries cannot be construed as seeking ‘information’ as defined under section 2(f) of the RTI Act. Consequently, the respondent did not have an obligation to provide such clarification or opinion under the RTI Act. In this

context, reliance is placed on matter of *Azad Singh vs. CPIO, Oriental Insurance Company Limited* (order dated March 23, 2021) wherein Hon'ble CIC observed that "7. *The Commission, after hearing the submissions of both the parties and after perusal of records, observed that some queries of the appellant are in the nature of seeking explanation/opinion/advice/confirmation/clarification from the CPIO and he has expected that the CPIO firstly should analyze the documents and then provide information to the appellant. But the CPIO is not supposed to create information; or to interpret information; or to compile information as per the desire of the appellant under the ambit of the RTI Act. As per Section 2(f) of the RTI Act, the reasons/opinions/advice can only be provided to the applicants if it is available on record of the public authority. The CPIO cannot create information in the manner as sought by the appellant. The CPIO is only a communicator of information based on the records held in the office and hence, he cannot be expected to do research work to deduce anything from the material therein and then supply it to him.*" Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.

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**