

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

Appeal No. 6828 of 2026

Shamo Devi : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated March 24, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated April 07, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated April 07, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00129). 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 March 24, 2026, sought the following information regarding refund received in PACL matter:

“Why have I received only RS549 as refund against my total investment of RS 34,650?

Whether my refund process has been completed or is still pending?

What is the expected timeline for receiving the remaining/pending refund amount? Are there any deficiencies, errors, or issues in my claim application? If yes, please provide complete details and also inform whether I will be given an opportunity to rectify/correct the same and resubmit the required documents.

What is the basis or calculation method used for determining the refund amount in PACL cases? I request you to kindly provide the above information.”

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 the details

of PACL Matters – Public Notice, 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 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 requested the instant forum to obtain the information from the concerned authority/Committee. 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. Further, 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 necessary in this regard.
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 30, 2026

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