

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

Appeal No. 7013 of 2026

Ankur Dwivedi

:

Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai

:

Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated July 24, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated August 03, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated August 03, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00288). 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 dated July 24, 2026, sought the following information:

“I want to say that I buyed PACL 2 bonds in 2010 and I payed annual premium till 2015 then on maturity my original bonds were taken by PACL officials on the name of payment and one manual receipt was given at that time SEBI interfered and JUSTICE RM Lodha committee was made I also registered for my payment maturity but my status shows Land allotted I have not got any land from PACL till now you can properly check and investigate so please return my money which I am waiting for so many years as PACL was fraud company so record and data given by them is false my bond numbers are U264157xxx & U264157xxx so please provide the data of Land allotted by PACL on my bonds and documents of land allotment and place.”
3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the information sought is not available with SEBI. The respondent also 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 aforementioned Committee. Further, the details of PACL Matters – Public Notices, Press Releases, Status Report, and FAQs etc. are available on SEBI website.

4. **Ground of appeal** – On perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response of the respondent.
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. 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. The respondent has also advised the appellant to approach the aforementioned Committee. 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 25, 2026

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