

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

Appeal No. 6580 of 2025

Sree Hari S : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated September 23, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated September 26, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00263) dated September 29, 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. **Queries in the application** - The appellant, in his application dated September 23, 2025, sought the following information:

“ 1. Whether SEBI has any plans to conduct Grade A (Assistant Manager) recruitment in the year 2025? If yes, please provide the tentative timeline for notification release.

2. What is the expected number of vacancies specifically for General stream (UnReserved category) for the 2025 recruitment cycle, if planned?

3. Please provide the tentative schedule for the following activities for 2025 recruitment (if decided):

a) Notification release date

b) Application start and end dates

c) Phase I examination date

d) Phase II examination date

f) Interview dates

4. Please provide copies of any internal communications, minutes of meetings, or official decisions taken regarding the 2025 Grade A recruitment planning.

5. If 2025 recruitment is not planned, when is the next Grade A recruitment cycle expected and what is the rationale for the delay?

6. Please provide the official policy or guidelines that govern the timing and frequency of SEBI Grade A recruitments.”

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to query nos. 1 -2 & 5 in the application, 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. Notwithstanding the aforesaid, the respondent informed that vacancies arise due to promotions, resignations and retirements of employees and that SEBI undertakes recruitment and promotion exercises periodically to fill up the vacancies. The respondent also informed that details regarding recruitment exercises are published on SEBI website.

The respondent, in response to query no. 3, informed that the query is vague and is 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. 4 & 6, informed that the information sought pertains to the internal functioning of SEBI and relates to the systems and procedures followed at SEBI. In view of the same, the information sought by you is exempt u/s 8(1)(a) of the RTI Act.

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. With respect to query nos. 1, 2, 3, & 5, I concur with the response of the respondent that the queries are in the nature of seeking clarification or 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 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/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.

6. With respect to query nos. 4 & 6, I agree with the response of the respondent that the requested information pertains to internal functioning of SEBI and relates to systems and procedure followed by SEBI. In this context, I note that in *ICAI v. Shaunak H. Satya*, [(2011) 8 SCC 781], the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that: - "*The competent authorities under the RTI Act will have to maintain a proper balance so that while achieving transparency, the demand for information does not reach unmanageable proportions affecting other public interests, which include efficient operation of public authorities and the Government, preservation of confidentiality of sensitive information and optimum use of limited fiscal resources.*" 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: October 13, 2025

RUCHI CHOJER

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