

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

Appeal No. 6873 of 2026

| | | |
|--------------------|----|------------|
| Sarbjit Kaur | : | Appellant |
| | Vs | |
| CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai | : | Respondent |

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated nil (received by SEBI on April 02, 2026) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated April 08, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated nil (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/P/26/00026, received by the Office of Appellate Authority on May 08, 2026). 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 regarding his refund claim in PACL matter.:

“i. Kindly provide a copy of the record / data furnished by PACL Ltd. on the basis of which it has been stated that land measuring 150 Sq. Yards was allotted to the above mentioned investor.

ii. Kindly provide complete details of such alleged land allotment, including:

- a. Plot number*
- b. Location of the land*
- c. Date of allotment*

iii. Kindly provide copies of any documents evidencing allotment of land in favour of the investor

iv. Kindly provide copies of any documents evidencing delivery of possession of the said land/plot to the investor

v. Kindly clarify whether any verification was carried out by SEBI before rejecting the claim on the basis of PACL data. If yes, provide details and relevant documents.

vi. Kindly provide the rules/guidelines under which such claims (where land is shown as allotted) are rejected for refund

vii. Kindly inform whether the claimant is entitled to challenge or seek reconsideration of such rejection and the procedure for the same.”

3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the information sought is not available with SEBI. Notwithstanding the aforesaid, the respondent informed that the details of PACL matters-public notices, press releases, status reports and FAQs etc. are available on SEBI website.
4. **Ground of appeal** – On perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response of the respondent.
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 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: June 02, 2026

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