

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

Appeal No. 7034 of 2026

Arvind Soni

:

Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai

:

Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated July 21, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated July 28, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated August 10, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00303). 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 July 21, 2026, sought the following information:

“1. List of PACLs land holdings in Jaisalmer and the reasons for the same

2. Disposal of land with proper documents (Procedure for obtaining NOC)

3. Please provide entire reason for objection for holding this Khasra No. 228/445 and 237/446 (Sagaron ki Basti, Sam, Jaisalmer), in this khasra number which seller sold this land to PACL

4. Please provide order copy of CBI court for above mention case .”
3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the information sought is not available with SEBI. The respondent also stated that all communication regarding refund status is handled by the Justice (Retd.) R.M. Lodha Committee. The respondent also advised the appellant to

approach the aforementioned Committee. 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 (**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. The appellant, in his appeal, has requested the instant forum to direct the respondent to transfer his application to the concerned public authority. 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 Hon'ble CIC in its decision in *M Shanmugam v CPIO, Pearls Agrotech Corporation Ltd. & Or.* (Date of decision: 14.03.2024) had accepted the contention of the respondent that the Justice Lodha Committee is not a public authority under section 2(h) of the RTI Act. Accordingly, I find that not further intervention of this forum is warranted.
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: September 04, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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