

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

Appeal No. 6976 of 2026

Chhabeg Singh

:

Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai

:

Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated July 10, 2026 received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated July 14, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated July 15, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00258). 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. The appellant, in his appeal, has raised dispute only with the response of the respondent to query nos. 1 to 3 in the application.
3. **Query nos. 1 to 3 in the application** - The appellant, vide the aforementioned queries, sought the following information:

“ 1 Please provide certified copies of any physical proof registered sale deeds government land registries or allotment letters submitted by PACL Limited to SEBI Lodha Committee claiming land was lawfully registered or transferred to Investor Chhabeg Singh PAN FHYxxxxx under Registration Nos U008028xxxx and U008028xxxx

2 If no such registered sale deed or property document exists in official records held by SEBI please state the official protocol procedure for an investor to get this false Land Allotted Yes status flag overridden or deleted from the active database to enable the direct bank transfer of the refund

3 Please provide the expected timeframe or fixed timeline within which an investors account is rectified and cleared for a direct bank account principal refund once a complaint regarding fraudulent land entry is formally recorded .”

4. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the information sought is not available with SEBI. The respondent also informed that all communication regarding refund status is handled by the Justice (Retd.) R.M. Lodha Committee and advised the appellant to approach the Committee. The respondent also informed that the details of PACL matters- Public Notices, Press Releases, Status Report and FAQs etc. are available on SEBI website.
5. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was provided incomplete, misleading or false information.
6. 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 (**CIC**) 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.
7. The appellant, in his appeal, has contended that the respondent has failed to comply with section 6(3) of the RTI Act. The appellant, in this regard, has requested the instant forum to direct the respondent to transfer his application to the concerned public authority. , 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, I note that 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. In light of the aforesaid, I find that no further intervention of this forum is warranted.
8. 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 07, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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