

**Before Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.)  
In the matter of PACL Ltd.**

**File no. 624**

**Applicants :** (i) Smt P. Shanti w/o P. G. Prithiviraj, Salem, Tamil Nadu  
(Registration No. U322072461 dated 10-10-2011);  
(ii) Shri M. R. Haswin Kumar s/o M.R. Ramesh Kumar, Salem, Tamil Nadu  
(Registration No. U322128344 dated 05-08-2013);  
(iii) Smt. Vijaya w/o R. Jayapal, Salem, Tamil Nadu  
(Registration No. U322090725 dated 06-03-2012);

**Present :** None

**Order :**

1. (a) It may be noticed at the outset that vide order dated 02/02/2016, passed in civil appeal no. 13301/2015 bearing the title Subarata Bhattacharaya Versus Securities & Exchange Board Of India, the Hon'ble supreme court had directed constitution of a committee by SEBI to be headed by Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.M. Lodha former Chief Justice of India as its Chairman for disposing of the land purchased by PACL so that the sale proceeds recovered there from can be paid to the investors who have invested their funds in the company for purchase of the land.

(b) 2<sup>nd</sup> Status Report (Volume-I) of the Justice (Retd.) R.M. Lodha Committee (in the matter of PACL Ltd) submitted before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, had at page 77 thereof, purposed as under :-

“It would be in the interest of the investors of the Company, that all objections based on documents purportedly executed after 02-02-2016 be scrutinized and then heard and disposed of by a retired Judicial Officer(s) assisted by requisite number of Advocates, appointed by the Committee.”

(c) The aforesaid proposal of committee was accepted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

2. (a) Subsequent thereto, I have been appointed by the said committee to hear objections/representations against attachments of various properties in the matter of PACL Ltd which appointment has been duly notified in SEBI Press release no. 66 dated 08/12/2017.

(b) My said appointment is also duly mentioned in the order dated 15/11/2017 (to be read with orders dated 13/04/2018, 02/07/2018 and 07/12/2018) of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in civil appeal no. 13301/2015 Subrata Bhattacharya Vs SEBI.

3. This common order will dispose off the three applications of all persons named above who are seeking recovery of the amounts statedly invested by them with PACL as detailed in their respective applications.
4. The applicant Smt. P. Shanti w/o P.G. Prithiviraj seeks refund of Rs. 30,000/- with the averment that she had invested the said amount with PACL India Ltd on 10/10/2011 as per registration certificate no. U322072461 dated 10/10/2011 for allotment of 600 Sq. Yd. plot. It is contended that the said agreement has matured on 10/04/2017 but she has not heard anything further from PACL.
5. The applicant Shri M.R. Haswin Kumar s/o M.R. Ramesh Kumar seeks refund of Rs. 62,500/- with the averment that he had invested the said amount with PACL India Ltd on 31/12/2011 as per registration certificate no. U322128344 dated 05/08/2013 for allotment of 1000 Sq. Yd. plot. It is contended that the said agreement has matured on 05/08/2019 but he has not heard anything further from PACL.
6. The applicant Smt. J. Vijaya w/o R. Jayapal seeks refund of Rs.75,000/-with the averment that she had invested the said amount with PACL India Ltd on 06/03/2012 as per registration certificate no. U322090725 dated 06/03/2012 for allotment of 1000Sq.Yd. plot. It is contended that the said agreement has matured on 06/03/2018 but she has not heard anything further from PACL.
7. (a) The applicants above named are seeking recovery of the amounts indicated in the foregoing paras but prayer for refund of money invested with PACL cannot be dealt with by me because my mandate is confined to dealing with objections/representations received by the Committee 'against' attachment of properties detailed in [www.auctionpacl.com](http://www.auctionpacl.com), which aspect is duly referred to in the order dated 15/11/2017 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed in civil appeal no. 13301/2015 titled Subrata Bhattacharya vs SEBI, and also duly notified in SEBI Press release no. 66 dated 08/12/2017 for the guidance of investors.  
  
(b) No notice is thus required to be issued to the above named persons and the applications detailed above seeking refund of the amounts claimed therein cannot be entertained by me and are accordingly rejected.

Date : 13/03/2019

  
R. S. Virk  
Distt. Judge (Retd.)