

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

Appeal No. 6667 of 2026

Vikram Balode : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated November 27, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated December 22, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00336) dated December 23, 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. The appellant, in his appeal, has raised dissatisfaction only with respect to the response to query nos. 1, 2 and 3 in the application.
3. **Query nos. 1, 2 and 3 in the application** - The appellant, in his application dated November 27, 2025, sought the following information:

“1. Provide the total number of applications received for the post of Assistant Manager Grade A (SEBI/HO/HRD/DRS/03/2025-26) up to the last date of application submission.

2. Provide the number of applications received for each post or stream separately. This includes General Stream, Legal, Information Technology, Research, Civil Engineering, Electrical Engineering and all other streams.

3. Provide the category wise breakup of applications received for each post.”

4. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to query nos. 1, 2 & 3 the application, informed that the information sought is available on SEBI website under “careers” section. The respondent also provided the link for accessing the same.

5. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was provided incomplete, misleading or false information.
6. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. I note the respondent, in his reply, has provided the link for accessing the requested information from SEBI website. In this regard, the appellant, in his appeal, has stated that he is not able to access the information from the link provided by the respondent. However, I note that the said link is active. On consideration, I find that the requested information is available on SEBI website and hence, is in the public domain. In this regard, the Hon'ble Delhi High Court, in the matter of *Registrar of Companies & Ors. Vs. Dharmendra Kumar Garg & Anr.* and the Hon'ble Central Information Commission (CIC), in the matter of *Shri K Lall vs. Shri M K Bagri* (CIC/AT/A/2007/00112, order dated April 12, 2007), *inter alia*, observed that if the relevant information is available in the public domain, the same cannot be said to be information held by the public authority and consequently, there is no obligation to provide such information to an applicant under the RTI Act. Further, Hon'ble CIC in the matter of *Kul Bhushan Jain vs. CPIO, SEBI* (Order dated December 22, 2022) observed that “*The Commission noted that the reply given by the CPIO was appropriate as he first quoted the relevant notifications with their dates -8th June 2018 and 30th November 2018. He also informed the appellant that these gazette notifications are available on the SEBI website. A link was also given to access the same. The FAA quoted certain court rulings which state that once the information is available on a website, it is in public domain and no longer held or under the control of the public authority. The FAA had also stated that the link was provided to access the information and the link is active. The same was reiterated vide the written submissions dated 16.2.2022 which was also endorsed to the appellant. The Commission is in agreement with the submissions advanced by the Representative of the CPIO. From the submissions, it is abundantly clear that the information is available on the given website and hyper link..... Therefore, no further action is warranted in the present case.*” 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: January 19, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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