

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

Appeal No. 6983 of 2026

Anivesh Kumar Pandey : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated June 23, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated July 16, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated July 16, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00262). 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. Please provide the individual marks obtained by the candidate (Roll No. 1921000964) in Phase II Paper 1, Phase II Paper 2, and the Personal Interview specifically conducted under the SEBI Grade A 2025 recruitment drive.

2. Please provide the final aggregate weighted score of the candidate (Roll No. 1921000964) utilized for the final merit list preparation of the SEBI Grade A 2025 recruitment drive.

3. Please provide the exact status, rank, or serial number of the candidate (Roll No. 1921000964) in the official Waiting List for the General Stream under the SEBI Grade A 2025 recruitment drive.

4. Please provide a compiled sheet or table (anonymized using Roll Numbers or Rank Numbers) showing the marks obtained in Phase II Paper 1, Phase II Paper 2, Phase II Total Aggregate, and the Personal Interview of the top 100 selected candidates in the General Stream final merit list for the SEBI Grade A 2025 recruitment drive.

5. Please provide the final category-wise minimum cut-off marks (weighted aggregate score) required for final selection in the General Stream, as well as the minimum cut-off marks required to qualify for the Waiting List under the SEBI Grade A 2025 recruitment drive.

7. Please provide EWS candidates previous employer name with respective Designation”

3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to query nos. 1, 2, 3 and 5 in the application, informed that the relevant information pertaining to SEBI Recruitment Exercise 2025 has been published on SEBI website and provided the links for accessing the same.

With regard to query no.4, the respondent informed that the information sought is not maintained in the desired format. Notwithstanding the aforesaid, the respondent informed that the marks obtained by 135 selected candidates is published on SEBI website and provided the link for accessing the same.

With regard to query no. 6, the respondent informed that the information sought is not maintained in the desired format.

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 regard to query nos. 1, 2, 3 and 5, the respondent has informed that the relevant information pertaining to SEBI Recruitment Exercise 2025 has been published on SEBI website. Hence, I note that the requested information is available in the public domain. In this context, I note that the Hon’ble Delhi High Court in *Registrar of Companies & ors. Vs. Dharmendra Kumar Garg & anr.* and the Hon’ble CIC in *Shri K Lall vs. Shri M K Bagri* (CIC/AT/A/2007/00112, order dated April 12, 2007) held that if the relevant information is available in the public domain, the same cannot be said to be information held by the public authority and consequently there is no obligation to provide such information to an applicant under the RTI Act. Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the said response of the respondent.
6. With regard to query nos. 4 and 6, the respondent has informed that the information sought is not maintained by SEBI in the manner/format as specified. I note that the CPIO is expected to provide information that is available and existing in the records. In this context, I note that similar response/submission provided by the respondent was accepted by the Hon’ble CIC in the matter of the *Prateek Tewari v. CPIO, SEBI* (Order dated January 19, 2023) and it was observed that “In respect to point no. 13 the information sought cannot be directed to be

disclosed as the same was sought in a particular format and the CPIO submitted that the same is not available in that format.”.

In view of these observations, I do not find any deficiency in the response.

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: August 13, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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