

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

Appeal No. 7046 of 2026

Vaibhav Bansal : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated July 16, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated July 31, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated August 16, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00312). I have perused the application, the response of the respondent 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, sought the following information:
 1. *“How many candidates possessed the post qualification experience of 2 years amongst the candidates selected in SEBI Grade A legal stream, whose results were announced on June 23, 2026?”*
 2. *What are the roll numbers of the above candidates?*
 3. *What is the marks distribution of Phase II paper 2 exam awarded to the candidate possessing roll number 2101000490 named Vaibhav Bansal, i.e., how many marks were awarded for MCQ section and how many for legal descriptive section?”*
3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to query nos. 1 & 2, in the application, informed that the information sought by the appellant is not readily available. The respondent stated that for providing a response to the same, data which is maintained in separate files need to be collated and lot of time and manpower will have to be devoted for the same. The respondent thus informed that this would disproportionately divert the resources of the public authority. Hence the same is exempt u/s 7(9) of the RTI Act.

With regard to query no 3, the respondent provided the marks for Phase II, Paper 2- Objective and Descriptive paper.

4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was refused access to the information requested.
3. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. With regard to query nos. 1 and 2, I note that the requested information is not readily available with the respondent in the manner as sought by the appellant and that the respondent would be required to analyse and collate information which is maintained in separate individual files placed at multiple locations. In my opinion, analysing and collating would disproportionately divert the resources of SEBI and would defeat ‘the practical regime of right to information’ as envisaged in the preamble of the RTI Act. In this context, I note that the Hon’ble Central Information Commission (hereinafter referred to as “**CIC**”), in the matter of *Mr. Deepak Girdhar vs. CPIO, SEBI* (Order dated March 30, 2021), observed that “6. *The Commission, after hearing the submissions of the respondent and after perusal of records, observes that the information sought by the appellant is voluminous in nature and may not be readily available with the CPIO in the manner as sought by the appellant, collating and compiling of which would disproportionately divert the resources of the respondent organization. Hence, the disclosure of information is exempted as per Section 7(9) of the RTI Act.*” In view of these observations, I find that the requested information is exempt from disclosure under section 7(9) of the RTI Act. With regard to query no. 3, I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the query by providing the information available with him. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
4. Further, I note that the appellant in his appeal has sought further information pertaining to his application. As held by the Hon’ble CIC in *Harish Prasad Divedi vs. Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited* (decided on January 28, 2014), an information seeker cannot be allowed to expand the scope of his RTI enquiry at appeal stage. Accordingly, I find that the said submissions do not warrant consideration at this stage.

5. 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: September 09, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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