

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

Appeal No. 5071 of 2022

Bittu	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated April 29, 2022 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated May 18, 2022, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated May 22, 2022. 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, vide his application dated April 29, 2022, sought the following information:
 1. *Number of students selected in phase 2 exam of General Stream from Unreserved category*
 2. *Number of students selected in phase 2 exam of General Stream from ST, SC, OBC category*
 3. *Number of students selected in phase 2 exam of General Stream from Persons With Disability category (all types) separately namely locomotive, autism, hearing, blindness.*
3. The respondent, in response to the aforesaid queries, informed that the information sought may be disclosed after the process of final selection of candidates is completed, upon receipt of specific requests under RTI Act.
4. **Ground of appeal-** The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that access to the requested information was refused.
5. I have perused the query and the response provided thereto. I note that the respondent informed regarding when the requested information regarding recruitment will be shared. I note that the recruitment process is not over and pre-mature disclosure might hinder the ongoing process. In this context, the Hon’ble CIC, in the matter of *Shri U.R.M. Raju Vs. Visakhapatnam Port Trust* (judgement

dated March 09, 2009 in CIC/AT/A/2008/01463), observed: *“If information regarding current recruitment processes is authorized to be disclosed even before such a process is completed, it is possible that it would pave the way for wholly absurd claims for disclosures. For example, a petitioner may, citing precedent, demand information regarding various aspects of a recruitment process undertaken by the Public Service Commissions and, such other recruitment bodies, even before such a process is completed and thereby throw the entire process into disarray. No public interest shall be served by such disclosures. On the contrary, such premature disclosures shall have a deleterious impact on public interest and will serve no public purpose.”* In view of the said observations, I do not find any deficiency in the response.

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: June 20, 2022

ANAND BAIWAR

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