

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

Appeal No. 7109 of 2026

Suneeta Devi Sachan : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated September 07, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated September 23, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated September 27, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00365). 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 her application, sought the following information:

“Under the Right to Information Act 2005 kindly provide the following information regarding PACL Certificate U063744xxx issued in the name of SUNITA DEVI SACHAN

1 Please provide the present status of PACL Certificate U063744xxx and the reason for non processing or non payment of the refund claim

2 The portal currently displays the status that the application for PACL Certificate U063744xxx could not be processed further as against the said PACL Certificate land has been allotted as per the data provided by PACL Ltd Please provide the complete details of the land allegedly allotted against this certificate including land identification details location date of allotment area and the authority or record on the basis of which such allotment was made

3 Please provide a certified copy of the record document or data received from PACL Ltd on the basis of which it has been determined that land was allotted against Certificate U063744xxx

4 Please clarify whether the allotment of land against this certificate has been independently verified by SEBI Committee or any competent authority. If yes please provide the relevant verification record order or document

5 Please provide the present status of the alleged allotted land and whether possession was ever recorded as delivered to the investor SUNITA DEVI SACHAN

6 Please inform whether the investor can claim refund if the alleged land allotment is incorrect unverifiable or possession was never given. Please provide the applicable rule order or guideline

7 Please provide the procedure and documents required for correction of investor name discrepancy where the PACL certificate bears the name SUNITA DEVI SACHAN while the investors Aadhaar and PAN bear the name SUNEETA DEVI SACHAN. The difference is only in spelling of the name

8 Please provide the name designation and contact details of the authority or office responsible for resolving the above issue and processing the claim. Relevant details PACL Certificate U063744776 Investor name as per PACL Certificate SUNITA DEVI SACHAN .”

3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the information sought is not available with SEBI. Further, the respondent informed that the details of PACL Matters- Public Notices, Press Releases, Status Report and FAQs etc. are available on SEBI website.
4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that she was provided incomplete, misleading or false information.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. The respondent, in his response, has categorically mentioned that the requested information is not available with SEBI. In this context, I note that the Hon’ble Central Information Commission (**CIC**) in the matter of *Sh. Pattipati Rama Murthy vs. CPIO, SEBI* (Decision dated July 8, 2013), held: “... if it (SEBI) does not have any such information in its possession, the CPIO cannot obviously invent one for the benefit of the Appellant. There is simply no information to be given.” Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
6. Notwithstanding the above, I note that the responsibility of disposal of the properties and repayment to investors, is entrusted with the Justice (Retd.) R. M. Lodha Committee (under the Chairmanship of Hon’ble Mr. Justice R.M. Lodha, former Chief Justice of India), which has been constituted, pursuant to the order dated February 2, 2016 of the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India. I also note that the respondent has provided

the links for accessing Status Reports, FAQs, Press Releases and Public Notices pertaining to the matter of PACL Ltd., which are already available in the public domain. The appellant may be guided accordingly.

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: October 12, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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