

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

Appeal No. 6781 and 6782 of 2026

Krishnadas K S

: Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai

: Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated January 11, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated February 06, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed identical appeals (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00093 and SEBIH/A/E/26/00094) dated February 27, 2026. I have carefully considered the application, the response and the appeals and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record.
2. **Queries in the application** - The appellant, in his application dated January 11, 2026, sought the following information:

“Information Request regarding the Linguistic Exclusivity of SEBI Recruitment Process.

Under the Right to Information Act 2005, please provide the following:

Justification for Partial Inclusivity: Provide the administrative reasoning or Board-approved policy that permits the inclusion of Hindi as a medium of examination while excluding other regional languages listed in the 8th Schedule.

Policy on Neutrality: In the absence of regional language translations, state the reason why the exam is not conducted in English only to ensure that no single linguistic group (Hindi speakers) receives a mother-tongue advantage over others.

Deterrence Data: Does SEBI maintain data on the state-wise distribution of applicants for the Grade A exam? If yes, please provide the percentage of applicants from non-Hindi speaking states for the last three years.

Alternative Language Feasibility: Provide copies of any file notings, minutes of meetings, or feasibility reports where SEBI discussed the implementation of regional languages in line with the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 mandates.

Cost Analysis: Has any budget been allocated or a third-party agency (like NTA) been consulted for the translation of the 2025-26 papers into regional languages? Provide details.”

3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to the application, informed that 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.
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. On consideration, I find that the appellant’s queries are in the nature of seeking clarification/opinion/confirmation 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 or confirmation 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 Central Information Commission(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/ advices 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.

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 24, 2026

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