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

Appeal No. 6987 of 2026

Sunil Rohilla	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated July 11, 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 19, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00266). 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 his application sought the following information:

   "I need a copy of the Valuation cum Inspection Report along with vacant property images of the property bearing address Entire Third Floor with Roof Rights D 27 NDSE Part 2 Tehsil Kalkaji District South East Delhi 110049 having MR Number 7379 16. I am the successful auction purchaser of the above property and have been issued Sale Certificate bearing reference number JRMLC PACL BKM 12996 2026 dated 14 May 2026 jointly in the names of Sunil Rohilla applicant and Suman Gupta."

3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to 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 he 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 (**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.

6. I note that the appellant, in his appeal, 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, 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 not further intervention of this forum is warranted.

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 14, 2026

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