

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

**Appeal No. 6798 of 2026**

: Appellant  
Hariom Yadav Vs

: Respondent  
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application dated March 01, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated March 16, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated March 16, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00104). 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, vide his application, sought the following information:

*1. As per records of PACL Ltd., land has been shown as allotted against my Father PACL Certificate No. U004027xxxxx. Kindly provide complete details of the said land including:*

*a) State and District*

*b) Village / Survey number*

*c) Area of land*

*d) Date of allotment*

*2. Kindly provide copies of documents, if any, showing:*

*a) Possession letter issued to me*

*b) Registry / sale deed / mutation in my name*

3. *Kindly clarify whether any physical possession of land was ever handed over to my Father Sileti singh Yadav, and if yes, the date and proof of such possession.*

4. *Kindly clarify the reason for rejection / non-processing of my refund claim despite non-receipt of any land or benefit by me. My father an affected investor and the above information is required for justice and record.”*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to queries in the application, informed that the information sought is not available with SEBI. However, 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 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. 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: April 02, 2026**

**RUCHI CHOJER**

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