

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

**Appeal No. 6874 of 2026**

Anandmohan Sanjivkumar Chaudhary : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application dated April 25, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated May 05, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated May 10, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00171). 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 dated April 25, 2026, sought the following information:

*“Request for Information under RTI Act, 2005 regarding PACL Refund Claim Registration No U31403xxxx and Registration No U314040xxxx*

*1 Please provide the specific details and copies of documents available in your records based on which the status of my claim Registration No U314037xxxx or U314040xxxx is marked as PACL Land Allotment Yes*

*2 Provide information on the name of the authority or department that provided the data indicating that land was allotted to the investor Sanjivkumar Choudhary and Renuka Sanjiv Choudhary Certificate No U314037xxxx or U314040xxxx*

*3 Please provide the details of the specific plot number, location, and date of allotment as per the records held by the Justice Lodha Committee for the aforementioned registration number*

*4 What is the prescribed procedure or the designated appellate authority to whom an investor should represent their case if the Land Allotment status is incorrectly marked in the portal*

*5 Provide information on the timeline within which such discrepancies in land allotment records are rectified by the Committee once a grievance is reported”*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to queries in the application, informed that the information sought is not available with SEBI. Further, 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 he 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 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. 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**