

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

**Appeal Nos. 6670 & 6671 of 2026**

Dibakar Sarkar : Appellant  
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed two identical applications [SEBIH/R/E/25/01498 dated November 18, 2025 and SEBIH/A/E/26/00011 dated December 12, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal)] under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The application dated November 18, 2025 was closed by the respondent, with the remark that the same was not viewable on RTI MIS portal. The respondent, by a letter dated January 08, 2026, provided his reply to the application dated December 12, 2025. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00339 dated December 24, 2025 with respect to his application dated November 18, 2025 and an appeal (Reg No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00011 dated January 09, 2026) against the reply of the respondent dated January 08, 2026. I have carefully considered the applications, the response and the appeal and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record.
2. **Queries in the applications** - The appellant, vide his applications, sought the following information:

*“ I request the following information regarding the SEBI Grade A (Assistant Manager) — 2024 recruitment, specifically for the General Stream:*

*1. Actual Marks Obtained by Each Finally Selected Candidate*

*Please provide actual (raw) marks scored by every finally selected candidate in the General Stream for the following:*

*Phase I*

*Paper 1 – Actual marks obtained*

- Paper 2 – Actual marks obtained

*Phase II*

- Paper 1 – Actual marks obtained

- Paper 2 – Actual marks obtained

*Interview*

- Actual marks obtained

*Note: I am requesting actual marks only, not normalized scores or weightage-adjusted marks.*

**2. Category of Each Finally Selected Candidate**

*The PDF published on SEBI's website only contains roll numbers.*

*I request you to provide the category (GEN/OBC/EWS/SC/ST) corresponding to each finally selected candidate's roll number in the General Stream list.*

**3. Format Requested**

*Please provide the data in a simple table or Excel/PDF format containing:*

- Roll Number
- Category
- Phase I Paper 1 Marks
- Phase I Paper 2 Marks
- Phase II Paper 1 Marks
- Phase II Paper 2 Marks
- Interview Marks”

**3. Reply of the Respondent dated January 08, 2026** –The respondent, in response to queries in the application, informed that the information sought by the appellant is not maintained in the requested format. Notwithstanding the aforesaid, the respondent informed that the marks obtained by candidates who qualified for interview, the list and number of selected candidates, minimum marks secured by the last selected candidate is available on SEBI website under “careers” section and provided the links for accessing the same.

**4. Ground of appeal:** The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was provided incomplete, misleading or false information.

5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. I note that respondent in his reply has categorically mentioned that the requested information is not available with SEBI in the format as sought by the appellant. In this context, I note that the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in its judgment dated 04.12.2014 in case of *The Registrar, Supreme Court of India vs. Commodore Lokesh K. Batra and Ors. [W.P.(C) No. 6634/2011]* has held as under: “*11. Insofar as the question of disclosing information that is not available with the public authority is concerned, the law is now well settled that the Act does not enjoin a public authority to create, collect or collate information that is not available with it. There is no obligation on a public authority to process any information in order to create further information as is sought by an applicant.....*” Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent. Notwithstanding the aforesaid, I note that the respondent has provided necessary guidance to the respondent.
6. In view of the above observations, I find that there is no need to interfere with the decision of the respondent. The appeals are accordingly dismissed.

Place: Mumbai

**RUCHI CHOJER**

Date: January 19, 2026

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