

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

Appeal No. 6989 of 2026

Valji Narayan Bhadra

:

Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai

:

Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated July 15, 2026 received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated July 20, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated July 21, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00268). 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 15, 2026, sought the following information:

“Kindly provide certified copies of the following records in respect of PACL Registration No. U171356xxx certificate no 2544xxx dated 19062009

1. Certified copy of the land allotment letter issued for PACL Registration No. U171356xxx.

2. Certified copy of the plot allotment record indicating the plot number, Survey/Khasra Number, village, taluka, district and state.

3. Certified copy of the possession letter, possession memo or possession certificate, if any.

4. Certified copy of any document bearing the signature/thumb impression of the investor or her lawful guardian acknowledging acceptance of the allotment or possession.

5. *Certified copy of the record, database entry, file noting or any other document relied upon to conclude that land was allotted while processing the refund application.*

6. *Certified copy of any note sheet, office record or communication available with the public authority relating to the allotment status of Registration No. U171356xxx.*

7. *If the information sought at Points 1 to 6 is not available, kindly provide a certified copy of the record indicating the source from which the information land allotted was obtained and recorded in respect of PACL Registration No. U171356xxx.*

Declaration The information sought is confined to certified copies of existing records maintained by the public authority. No clarification, opinion, explanation or interpretation is sought.”

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, 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 refused access to the information requested.
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 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: August 14, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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