

**BEFORE THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND FIRST APPELLATE AUTHORITY
INSOLVENCY AND BANKRUPTCY BOARD OF INDIA**

7th Floor, Mayur Bhawan, Shankar Market,
Connaught Circus, New Delhi -110001

Dated: 18th December 2025

**Order under section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI Act) in respect of RTI
Appeal Registration No. ISBBI/A/E/25/000128**

IN THE MATTER OF

Suresh S

... Appellant

Vs.

Central Public Information Officer

The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India

7th Floor, Mayur Bhawan, Shankar Market,

Connaught Circus, New Delhi -110001

... Respondent

1. The Appellant has filed the present Appeal dated 15th November 2025, challenging the communication of the Respondent, filed under the Right to Information Act (RTI Act). Since the Appeal required detailed analysis of different provisions of the RTI Act, same is disposed of within 45 days of receipt as enshrined in Section 19 of the RTI Act.

2. In its RTI application dated 13.10.2025, the Appellant had stated the following: -
“As per regulations and FAQ in the IBBI Website there is no maximum age limit for registering or appearing for the Limited Insolvency Examination (LIE). However, in the IBBI Website registration for LIE is possible only for applicants with Date of Birth after the year 1965 as the template does not allow entry of age with year of birth before 1965. In this regard I would like to know 1. Whether any maximum age limit has been fixed for registering or appearing for the LIE? If so, details of the amendment to the regulations 2. If no maximum age limit has been fixed for registering and appearing for the LIE, the reason for IBBI indirectly refusing registration and appearing for the LIE for persons having date of birth before 1965 illegally? 3. If the reason for the template not allowing year of birth before 1965 is purely technical and not intentional, reason for the officials of the IBBI not correcting the error even after emails sent earlier as per the file enclosed?”

The CPIO has, *inter-alia*, replied that no such technical error barring candidates above the age of 65 years to undertake LIE exists on the IBBI website. Accordingly, the CPIO has provided the link to access eligibility conditions for candidates appearing in the LIE. Aggrieved with the reply, the Appellant has filed the instant Appeal stating that the CPIO has wrongly denied the information sought.

3. I have carefully examined the application, the response of the Respondent and the instant Appeal and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record. In terms of section 2(f) of the RTI Act ‘information’ means “any material in any form, including records, documents, memos e-mails, opinions, advices, press releases, circulars, orders, logbooks, contracts, reports, papers, samples, models, data material held in any electronic form and information relating to any private body which can be accessed by a public authority under any other law for the time being in force.” It is pertinent to mention here that the Appellant’s “right to information’ flows from section 3 of the RTI Act and the said right is subject to the provisions of the Act. Section 2(j) of the RTI Act defines the “right to information” in term of information accessible under the Act which is held by or is under the control of a public authority. Thus, if the public authority

holds any information in the form of data, statistics, abstracts, etc. an applicant can have access to the same under the RTI Act subject to exemptions under section 8.

4. I note the grievance raised by the Appellant regarding an alleged technical impediment encountered while registering for the Limited Insolvency Examination, namely that the “*Date of Birth*” field on the examination portal ostensibly permits selection of the year only up to 1965. It is further noted that no such restriction is prescribed under the applicable regulations. Upon perusal of the examination portal, it is observed that the issue arises from the design of the user interface. Specifically, upon selecting the year 1965 in the relevant field, a drop-down list of earlier years automatically becomes available for selection. The grievance, therefore, pertains to a limited user-interface issue and not to any regulatory or substantive prohibition under the Code/regulations.
5. In view of the aforesaid, the reply of the CPIO does not merit any interference.
6. The Appeal is accordingly disposed of.

Sd/-
(Kulwant Singh)
First Appellate Authority

Copy to:

1. Appellant, Suresh S
2. CPIO, The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India, 7th Floor, Mayur Bhawan, Shankar Market, Connaught Circus, New Delhi -110001.