

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

Appeal Nos. 6819 & 6820 of 2026

Shamshad Kouser	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed two identical applications, one dated March 19, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) and second dated March 18, 2026 (received by SEBI on March 23, 2026) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by letters dated March 24, 2026 and April 08, 2026, respectively, responded to the applications filed by the appellant. The appellant filed two appeals dated March 27, 2026 and April 17, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/P/26/00021 and SEBIH/A/P/26/00024, received by the Office of Appellate Authority on April 02, 2026 and April 22, 2026 respectively). I have perused the applications, the response of the respondent and the appeals and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record.

2. **Queries in the applications-** The appellant, vide his applications, sought the following information:

“1. Whether SEBI provides facility to reopen or edit submitted PACL refund applications If yes provide full procedure

2. If no reasons for not allowing correction of genuine mistakes

3. Present status of refund claims of all 39 investors list enclosed

4. Reasons for partial payments despite full policy completion

5. Details of balance amount pending and expected timeline for release

6. Whether such cases will be reprocessed after correction

7. *Name designation and contact details of the concerned officer or department*”

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to the applications, 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** – On perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response of the respondent.
5. I have perused the applications 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 02, 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 appeals are accordingly dismissed.

Place: Mumbai
Date: April 28, 2026

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