

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

Appeal No. 6751 of 2026

Dibakar Sarkar : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed application dated January 23, 2026 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal] under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated February 11, 2026, provided his reply to the application. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. no. SEBIH/A/E/26/00067 dated February 11, 2026) against the reply of the respondent.
2. **Queries in the application** - The appellant, vide his application, sought the following information:

“I request the following information under the provisions of the Right to Information Act, 2005, 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 the actual (raw) marks obtained by every finally selected candidate in the General Stream in the following stages:

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 only the actual/raw marks, Normalized or weight-adjusted scores are not required.

2. Category of Each Finally Selected Candidate

The PDF published on SEBI's website only contains roll numbers of finally selected candidates. Kindly provide the category (GEN/ OBC/EWS/SC/ST) corresponding to each roll number in the General Stream final selection list."

3. **Reply of the Respondent**—The respondent, in response to query nos. 1 and 2 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 are available on SEBI website under “careers” section and provided the links for accessing the same.

With regard to query no. 3, the respondent has informed that the information sought is not specific and hence, the same cannot be construed as ‘information’ as defined under section 2(f) of RTI Act.

4. **Ground of appeal:** The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that the he was provided incomplete, misleading or false information.
5. I have perused the request and the response provided thereto. I note that similar information was sought by the appellant in his earlier RTI application (Reg. No. SEBIH/R/E/25/01655), for which the respondent had already provided the reply vide his letter dated January 08, 2026. Further, FAA order dated January 19, 2026 (Appeal no. 6670 & 6671 of 2026) was also passed with respect to the appeal [Reg No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00011 dated January 09, 2026] filed against the aforementioned reply. In the context of filing repetitive requests under RTI Act, the Hon’ble Central Information Commission in the matter of *Shri Ramesh Chand Jain vs. Delhi Transport Corporation, GNCTD, Delhi* (File No. CIC/AD/A/2013/001326—SA decided on June 25, 2014) held that “*The universal principles of civil justice also recognized ‘constructive res judicata’, which in the RTI context means when an applicant uses an opportunity of obtaining information on a particular subject as per law, he is expected to seek all the related information in that first ever opportunity itself. He cannot file another application for a bit or piece which he forgot to ask, or not advised by his lawyer, or for any other reason. He should ask all possible aspects of information about that subject matter, in the first ever available opportunity. Even if he does not, it is presumed by law that he asked for that and was refused after due trial..... Thus, once information is given, applicant shall not seek the same once again in the guise of different form or language. If the applicant seeks information again and again, the PIO, the First Appellate Authority and the Commission would be forced to spend their*

time on this repeated application, and in the process the authorities would lose that much time to address the other RTI applications or performing their general duties in their public office. Repeated RTI applications will amount to clogging the office of public authority and CPIO would be justified in refusing the same with intimation of reasons. Because the repeated RTI application has an effect of clogging the public offices, it would amount to obstructing the free flow of information to deserving and genuine RTI applicants, besides preventing the officers from performing their general duties attached to their office'. In view of the above, I find that no further intervention of this forum is warranted at this stage.

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

Date: March 05, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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