

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

Appeal No. 7066 of 2026

Saksham Puri : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated July 13, 2026 (received by SEBI on July 17, 2026) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated August 12, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated August 19, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/P/26/0059, received by the Office of Appellate Authority on August 27, 2026). 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:

“Under Section 6(1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005, kindly provide the following information relating exclusively to my candidature:

- 1. A certified electronic copy of my complete submitted and evaluated responses/ answer script for Phase II Paper I—English Descriptive Examination, including all essays, précis, comprehension answers Or other responses submitted by me.*
- 2. The question-wise or component-wise marks awarded to my responses in Phase II Paper 1.*
- 3. Copies of all annotations, remarks, corrections, comments or markings made by the evaluator on my descriptive responses, if maintained in the records.*
- 4. A certified electronic copy Of my response sheet for Phase II Paper 2—Legal Stream, showing:*
 - the questions displayed to me;*
 - the options selected by me;*
 - the answers treated as correct;*

- *the marks awarded question-wise, if maintained; and*
- *the total raw marks Obtained by me.*

5. *The complete paper-wise and section-wise breakup of marks obtained by me in Phase II, including:*

- *raw marks;*
- *normalized, scaled or equated marks, if applicable: and*
- *final marks considered for shortlisting.”*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the online examination for recruitment of SEBI Grade A Officer is conducted by Institute of Banking Personnel Selection (IBPS – Which is an autonomous body) within the terms of MoU as per which only IBPS is in possession of copies of question paper and evaluated descriptive paper, which is not shared with SEBI. Hence, the same is not available with SEBI.

Notwithstanding the aforesaid, the respondent informed that the relevant information pertaining to SEBI Recruitment Exercise 2025 has been published on SEBI website. Further, respondent provided the link for accessing the marks obtained by candidates in Phase II examination and interview. The respondent also provided the copy of the response sheet (answer marked by Roll No. 1301000618) and right answer key for the post of Officer Grade ‘A’ (Assistant Manager) 2025 Legal Stream – Phase II exam.

4. **Ground of appeal-** On perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response of the respondent.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I note that the respondent has informed that as per MOU, only IBPS is in possession of copies of question papers and evaluated descriptive papers, and the same is not shared with SEBI. I note that the respondent can only provide information that is available in the records. I find that as SEBI do not have access to the information sought, no information could be given. In this context, reliance is placed on the decision of Hon’ble Central Information Commission in the matter of *Lakshminarayanan R vs. SEBI* (order dated February 09, 2023), wherein it was observed that “*It is an established law that the information sought for in order to be disclosable under the RTI Act, 2005 must be existent and available in the records..... In the instant case, the desired information was not available in the records of the respondent authority*” 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 appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Place: Mumbai

Date: September 22, 2026

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