

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

Appeal No. 6963 of 2026

Sunita Devi : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated July 02, 2026 received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated July 08, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated July 08, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00247). 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 02, 2026, sought the following information:

“I, Sunita Devi, am an investor in PACL Limited holding Certificate Numbers U259137xxx and U259137xxx. My refund claim has been withheld on the SEBI Lodha Committee portal stating the reason as Land Allotted. I state categorically that I have never been allotted or given possession of any land by PACL. Under the RTI Act 2005, please provide the following specific information and documents within the stipulated time:

Provide the complete and exact address, plot number, and Khasra number of the specific land that SEBI Lodha Committee claims has been allotted to me against the above certificates.

Provide a certified true copy of the Allotment Letter or Possession Letter issued to me.

Provide a certified true copy of the document or agreement bearing my original signature or thumb impression, which proves my acceptance and physical possession of the said land.

If SEBI does not possess these signed documents, please explicitly confirm in writing that no such documentary proof exists in your records.”

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 refund status is handled by the Justice (Retd.) R. M Lodha Committee. The respondent also 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 she 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 her appeal, has contended that respondent had failed to transfer her application to Lodha Committee under Section 6(3) of the RTI Act. 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. In this context, it is pertinent to 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 no 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: July 31, 2026

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