

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

Appeal No. 6996 of 2026

Savita : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated July 02, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated July 08, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated July 25, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00275). 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 an investor in PACL Limited. My refund amount has been processed but unfortunately credited to a wrong bank account instead of my mapped/ correct bank account. Kindly provide me with the following information under the RTI Act, 2005:

What is the exact total amount approved for refund against my PACL Registration Number: U022403xxxx?

On which date was this approved amount transferred, and what are the specific Bank Name, Account Number, and IFSC code details where the amount was credited? Kindly provide the transaction reference/ UTR number.

What is the official procedure/remedy laid down by the PACL Refund Committee for investors whose amounts have been transferred to an incorrect or wrong bank account?

Is there an option or upcoming window on the PACL refund portal to edit, correct, or re-verify bank account details for failed or wrongly credited transactions? If yes, please provide the details.

Kindly provide the designated designation, address, and email ID of the grievance redressal officer or department handling such wrong transfer complaints for PACL.

Investor & Information Details for Reference: Investor Name: Savita PACL Registration Number: U0224xxxxx Certificate / Acknowledgement Number: U02240xxxxx.”

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 stated that all communication regarding refund status is handled by the Justice (Retd.) R.M. Lodha Committee. The respondent also advised the appellant to approach the said Committee. Further, the respondent 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 (**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. The appellant, in her appeal, has contended that the respondent had failed to transfer her application to the concerned public authority in accordance with section 6(3) of RTI Act. 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 a public authority under section 2(h) of the RTI Act. Accordingly, I find that no further action in this regard 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 21, 2026

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