

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

Appeal No. 5273 of 2022

Manish Goel	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated June 26, 2022 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated July 20, 2022, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated July 22, 2022, against the said response dated July 20, 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 four queries in his application dated June 26, 2022, *inter alia*, sought CCTV recordings of all CCTV cameras inside SEBI NRO from October 28, 2020 till date or recording available from the available date.
3. The respondent, in response to the aforesaid queries, informed that the CCTV has been installed for the safety of SEBI premises and its staff and that sharing of any CCTV devices will lead to creation of security hazards for all the staff working at/visitors coming to SEBI NRO premises and cause invasion of privacy. The respondent also informed that the requested information relates to personal information, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest and may cause unwarranted invasion into the privacy of the individual and may also endanger the life or physical safety of the persons. Accordingly, the same, exempt from disclosure under section 8(1)(g) and 8(1)(j) of the 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. On consideration, I agree with the response of the respondent that CCTV has been installed for the safety of SEBI promises and its staff. Sharing the

same may also cause invasion of privacy and disclose personal information related to employees and Staff. I also note that the appellant has not specified whether the requested information pertains to him or not. I find that the requested information is exempt from disclosure under section 8(1)(g) and 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act. In this context, I note that the Hon'ble CIC, in the matter of *Reena Richard v. State Bank of India, Mumbai* (Order dated November 28, 2014), observed that “*The respondents submitted that the appellant had not specified as to how she was connected to the information sought because the Branch could not locate any transaction done by the applicant on that branch on these days. They (sic) also submitted that the CCTV footage contained images of other customers doing their transactions and disclosure of that would result in unwarranted invasion of the privacy of third parties. They also added CCTV cameras had been installed at branches as a security measure and the disclosure of the information sought may result in the Bank getting exposed to the security risks.*” Further, the Hon'ble CIC, in the matter of *Md. Shakeel Ahmad vs. CPIO, Archaeological Survey of India* (order dated August 30, 2016), *inter alia*, observed that the Commission has not been in favour of unconditional provision of footage of CCTV cameras to RTI applicants as it could endanger the security of the premises, where those cameras are installed. In view of these 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: August 22, 2022

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