

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

Appeal No. 6974 of 2026

Sudha Devi

:

Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai

:

Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated July 11, 2026 received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated July 15, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated July 15, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00255). 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 dated July 11, 2026, sought the following information:

“I am the holder of PACL Certificate No. U06352xxx. While checking the status of my refund claim, I found the remark: Your application could not be processed further as against the said PACL Certificate Land has been allotted as per the data provided by PACL Ltd. I have never received any land, allotment letter, possession letter, sale deed, or any communication regarding the alleged allotment. Kindly provide the following information:

1. A certified copy of the record/ data received from PACL Ltd. showing that land has been allotted against PACL Certificate No. U0635xxxx.

2. The plot number, survey number, village, tehsil, district, and state of the alleged land allotted.

3. The date of allotment and a copy of the allotment letter or any document showing that the land was allotted to me.

4. A copy of the possession letter, if any, and any record showing that possession was offered or delivered.

5. *Copies of any correspondence, acknowledgement, or receipt bearing my signature in connection with the alleged allotment.*
6. *The rules, guidelines, or criteria under which my refund application was rejected or*
7. *kept unprocessed on the ground that land had been allotted.*
7. *If no such documentary records are available, kindly confirm the same in writing.”*

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 all communication regarding the refund status is handled by Justice (Retd.) R.M Lodha Committee and advised the appellant to approach the said Committee. The respondent also 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. 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 respondent has also advised the appellant to approach the said Committee. 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: August 07, 2026

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