

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

Appeal No. 6982 of 2026

Shantabai Ambu Rathod : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated July 08, 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 16, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00261). 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, sought the following information:

“I am the holder or legal claimant of PACL Certificate No. U18236xxxx. While checking the status of my refund application on the PACL Refund Portal the following remark is displayed. Your application could not be processed further as against the said PACL Certificate. Land has been allotted as per the data provided by PACL Ltd. However, I have never received possession of any land nor have I been provided with any allotment letter or supporting documents. Therefore I request the following information available on record.

- 1. Certified copy of the land allotment letter if any issued against PACL Certificate No. U18236xxxx*
- 2. Survey Number Gat Number Khasra Number of the land allegedly allotted.*
- 3. Plot Number land area and location details including Village Taluka Tehsil District and State.*
- 4. Date of allotment and date of possession if recorded.*

5. *Certified copies of all records documents correspondence electronic records or data received from PACL Ltd. on the basis of which it has been recorded that land was allotted.*
6. *Whether the land was ever registered or transferred in the name of the investor. If yes provide certified copies of the relevant records.*
7. *Current status of the land as per the records available with the Committee or SEBI.*
8. *Name and designation of the authority or officer who verified or accepted the data provided by PACL Ltd. regarding the alleged land allotment.*
9. *Whether any physical verification of the alleged allotment was conducted. If yes provide copies of the inspection report and related documents.*
10. *If no allotment documents are available on record kindly state the basis on which the refund application was rejected with the remark that Land has been allotted.*
11. *Please provide certified copies of all file notings internal correspondence and decisions relating to my refund application and the above remark.*
12. *If the requested information is held by any other public authority kindly transfer this application under Section 6(3) of the Right to Information Act 2005 and inform me accordingly..”*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response the application, informed that the information sought is not available with SEBI. Further, respondent informed that all communication regarding the refund status is handled by Justice (Retd.) R.M Lodha Committee and advised the appellant to approach the said 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.
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. 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 advised the appellant to approach the said Committee. The respondent has also 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 11, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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