

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

**Appeal No. 6512 of 2025**

Fardeen Shaikh : Appellant  
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application dated July 17, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated July 10, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00204) dated August 06, 2025. I have carefully considered the application, the response 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 17, 2025, sought the following information:

*“Kindly provide true, certified copy of all the properties of PACL and /or its Directors/Promoters/Employees/Agents/Groups and/or Associated Companies which have been restrained for sale vide the order dated 25/07/16 by Supreme court/and or latest order falling under:*

*Survey number 31/1-A, Nauxim or Chicalim Bhat, Aldeia de Goa, Bambolim, Tiswadi, North Goa-Goa Bhat properties. Having MR 345/16,MR 346/16,MR 5540/16,MR5546/16,MR 5547/16 as per Annexure C, Annexure D,Annexure E, Annexure F, Annexure G,Annexure J of letter SEBI/WRO/OW/64948/1/22 dated 30/12/2022 to District Collector,Office of District Collector,North Goa,Panaji Goa 40300.”*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to queries in the application, informed that the information sought is not available with SEBI. 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 refused access to information requested.
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: August 21, 2025

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